IMPORTANT SPEECHES AND PRESS CONFERENCES OF ZULFIKAR ALI BHUTTO

FOREIGN MINISTER
OF
PAKISTAN



ZULFIKAR ALI BHUTTO

A COMPENDIUM OF SPEECHES AND PRESS STATEMENTS

MADE FROM OCTOBER 1957 to JUNE 1966

BY ZULFIKAR ALI BHUTTO

Foreign Minister of Pakistan

PUBLISHED BY MA'AREF LIMITED
G.P.O. BOX 23, KARACHI, PAKISTAN
1966

PRINTED IN PAKISTAN
AT THE INTER SERVICES PRESS LIMITED
KARACHI-4.

CONTENTS

CHRONOLOGY OF SPEECHES

SPEECH

PAGE

PART I

LIFE SKETCH

LIFE SKETCH OF MR. ZULFIKAR ALI BHUTTO, H. PK., FOREIGN MINISTER OF PAKISTAN

Born at Larkana in January, 1928, Mr. Zulfikar Ali Bhutto has had a distinguished career and family background. He hails from one of the oldest aristocratic families of Sind with a tribal following in the former Sind, Baluchistan and the Punjab, and in Rajputana (India). His father, the late Sir Shahnawaz Khan Bhutto, advocated the separation of Sind, a Muslim majority region, from Bombay Presidency in the London Round Table Conference of 1931-32. Thus he was one of the pioneers who firmly believed that Muslims were a separate nation and were entitled to a separate homeland. Sir Shahnawaz was a Minister in the Bombay Government and became the first Chief Adviser of the Sind Government on the separation of Sind from the Bombay Presidency.

Mr. Z. A. Bhutto is married and has four children (two sons and two daughters).

Education

Mr. Zulfikar Ali Bhutto graduated with Honours in Political Science from the University of California, USA, in 1950, where he studied International Law and Jurisprudence under the celebrated Professor Hans Kelsen, Founder of the Vienna School of Jurisprudence and International Law. Later, Mr. Bhutto joined the Christ Church College at Oxford University (United Kingdom) and took his M.A. Honours with distinction in Jurisprudence in 1952. In 1953, he became a Barrister-at-Law from Lincoln's Inn, London.

On completion of his legal education in London, Mr. Bhutto was appointed Lecturer in International Law, University of Southampton, England. But he returned to Pakistan to start his own legal practice in West Pakistan

High Court of Karachi (1953-58). He also taught Constitutional Law in the Sind Muslim Law College at Karachi (1956-58).

Official Career

Mr. Bhutto was only 30 years old when he was first appointed Minister for Commerce in the Revolutionary Government in October, 1958, and thus became the youngest Central Minister in the Indo-Pakistan subcontinent. He held the portfolio of Commerce from October 1958 to the Middle of January, 1960, and was responsible for the introduction of the Export Bonus Scheme.

In January, 1960, Mr. Bhutto was assigned the portfolios of Minority Affairs and the National Reconstruction and Information which included Basic Democracies.

In April, 1960, Mr. Bhutto was given the additional charge of the newly created Ministry of Fuel, Power and Natural Resources and also of the Ministry of Kashmir Affairs.

Mr. Bhutto was re-appointed as a Minister in the new Cabinet of President Ayub Khan on 13 June, 1962 following the formation of a new government after the promulgation of the new Constitution. He was still the youngest member of the Cabinet.

Mr. Zulfikar Ali Bhutto was assigned the Ministry of External Affairs in January, 1963, in addition to his charge of the Ministry of Industries and Natural Resources and continued as Foreign Minister in the new Cabinet formed after elections in Pakistan on 24 March, 1965.

National Activities

Mr. Bhutto was responsible for important contributions to the Constitutional discussions which took place before the framing of the new Constitution. In the National Assembly and outside, Mr. Bhutto has performed valuable political duties.

Mr. Bhutto was a member of most of the important subcommittees of the Cabinet on the reforms introduced by the Revolutionary Government, and also a member of the Economic Committee of the Cabinet.

He was elected un-opposed to the National Assembly of Pakistan from Larkana Constituency in the elections held in March, 1962, under the new Constitution after the withdrawal of Martial Law.

Activities in the International Field

In 1957, Mr. Bhutto was appointed a member of Pakistan delegation to the twelfth session of the United Nations General Assembly. In February, 1958, Mr. Bhutto led the Pakistan delegation to the United Nations

Conference on the Law of the Sea at Geneva.

Mr. Bhutto was the leader of the Pakistan delegation to the fourteenth, fifteenth, eighteenth, nineteenth and twentieth sessions of the United Nations General Assembly in 1959, 1960, 1963, 1964 and 1965 respectively.

Mr. Bhutto also led the Pakistan delegation to the United Nations Security Council meeting in September/November, 1965 in connection with Indo-Pakistan conflict.

In April, 1960, Mr. Bhutto led Pakistan's delegation to India to evolve a joint Indo-Pakistan Press Code.

In September, 1960, he went on a special mission to Turkey to establish contacts with the post-revolutionary Turkish Government.

In December, 1960, he led Pakistan's delegation to Moscow to negotiate an Oil Agreement between Pakistan and U.S.S.R.

In December, 1961, Mr. Bhutto went on another special mission to European countries of the Consortium and U.K. for economic assistance for the Second Five Year Plan.

In January, 1962, he was also sent on a special mission to U.A.R., Ghana, U.K. and Ireland to muster support for the Kashmir debate in the Security Council.

In December, 1962, Mr. Bhutto was appointed Chief Delegate on Indo-Pakistan talks on Kashmir and held six rounds of negotiations with India (1962-63).

In March, 1963, Mr. Bhutto signed an agreement in Peking with the Chinese Foreign Minister on delimitation and demarcation of boundary.

In May, 1963, he led the Pakistan delegation to Tehran on re-establishment of diplomatic relations between Pakistan and Afghanistan.

In January, 1964, Mr. Bhutto was responsible for the signing of a Memorandum of the agreement with Burma, which established the permanent boundary between the two countries.

The same month, he was deputed by President Mohammad Ayub Khan to France for special discussions with President Charles de Gaulle.

In April, 1964, Mr. Bhutto led the Pakistan's delegation to the Preparatory Meeting of Foreign Ministers for the second Afro-Asian Conference at Djakarta.

In early June, 1964, he accompanied President Mohammad Ayub Khan to Ankara to establish closer collaboration between Pakistan, Iran and Turkey. He played an important role in the subsequent signing of the agreement at Istanbul for regional cooperation between the three countries.

In July, 1964, Mr. Bhutto accompanied President Ayub Khan to the historic Commonwealth Prime Ministers' Conference held in London, when, for the first time in the history of the Commonwealth, there was a reference to the Kashmir dispute in the final communique.

In October, 1964, Mr. Bhutto led the Pakistan delegation to the first session of the R.C.D. Conference in Tehran.

In January, 1965, Mr. Bhutto visited Moscow to hold discussions with the Soviet Foreign Minister on Pakistan and Soviet relations in the context of President Ayub's visit to U.S.S.R.

He accompanied President Mohammad Ayub Khan on State Visits to People's Republic of China in February/March, 1965 and to USSR in April, 1965.

In April, 1965, Mr. Bhutto led the Pakistan delegation to the Anniversary Celebrations of the Bandung Conference in Indonesia.

In May, 1965, he led the Pakistan delegation to SEATO Ministerial Council Meeting in London.

In June, 1965, he accompanied President Mohammad Ayub Khan to the Commonwealth Prime Ministers' Conference held in London.

In July, 1965, he attended the Afro-Asian Foreign Ministers' Conference in Algeria, and also represented President of Pakistan in the Summit Conference in Cairo of Pakistan, U.A.R., Indonesia and People's Republic of China.

The same month, he led the Pakistan delegation to the CENTO Anniversary Celebrations at Ankara.

In November, 1965, Mr. Bhutto visited the U.S.S.R., Czechoslovakia and Rumania for talks with the leaders of these countries.

In December, 1965, he accompanied the President of Pakistan on a tour to United Nations General Assembly, U.S.A., West Germany and Turkey.

In January, 1966, Mr. Bhutto accompanied the President of Pakistan to Kabul.

He also proceeded to Tashkent for summit talks between India and Pakistan on Kashmir issue and other miscellaneous matters concerning Indo-Pakistan relations (January, 1966).

He also led the Pakistan delegation to the Fourteenth CENTO Ministerial Council Meeting held at Ankara in April, 1966.

Recently he led the Pakistan delegation to the Fifth Session of the Council of Ministers of R.C.D. held at Tehran in May, 1966.

Awards

Mr. Bhutto has received the following awards:—

1. For his able and devoted services to the nation, he was awarded Hilal-i-Pakistan in June, 1964.
2. Nishan-i-Hamayun (first class) conferred by His Imperial Majesty, the Shah of Iran (October 1964).
3. Order of the Republic of Indonesia, conferred by President Soekarno

of Indonesia (April, 1965).

4. Decorated with the highest Argentine civil award, Gran Gruz De La Orden Del Libertador General San Martin, by the Argentine Foreign Minister on behalf of his President in March, 1966.

Membership of Organizations

1. President of the Abadgar Association, Larkana District.
2. Member of the West Pakistan Social Welfare Council.
3. President, Pakistan Islamic Council for International Affairs.
4. Chairman, Board of Governors of Pakistan Administrative Staff College, Lahore.

PART II

UNITED NATIONS GENERAL ASSEMBLY

Address to the Sixth Committee of the United Nations General Assembly on October 25, 1957

Mr. Chairman,

My delegation has heard most attentively the statements made thus far. The task of defining the concept or motion of aggression is indeed a gargantuan one. We have to face this delicate issue in a spirit of fallability and caution. Sir Francis Bacon began his essay "Of Truth" by saying, "What is truth? said jesting Pilate, and would not stay for an answer". If Pontius Pilate were confronted with the task facing this Committee, I seriously doubt if the Roman governor would even ask the question.

At its 368th plenary meeting on January 31, 1952, the General Assembly adopted resolution 599 (VI), which states, *inter alia,*

> "Considering that, although the existence of the crime of aggression may be inferred from the circumstances peculiar to each particular case it is nevertheless possible and desirable, with a view to ensuring international peace and security and to developing International Criminal Law to define aggression by reference to the elements which constitute it."

This resolution establishes three conclusions:

(a) that aggression is a crime;

(b) that the existence of this crime can be inferred from the circumstances peculiar to each particular case without specifically defining the crime of aggression;

(c) that, notwithstanding this, it is possible and desirable to define aggression to ensure international peace and security and to develop international criminal law.

And with this end in view, the question of defining aggression was considered thoroughly at various levels, all known to this Committee. However, it is pertinent to observe that the first wave of enthusiasm envisaged

in the passage of resolution 599(VI) was considerably mellowed and dented on a fuller analysis; so that the General Assembly was constrained to take cognizance of the innate catena of complexities by adopting, at its 408th plenary meeting, another resolution, being resolution 688(VII), which stipulates *inter alia,*

"Considering that the discussion of the question of defining aggression at the sixth and seventh sessions of the General Assembly and in the International Law Commission has revealed the complexity of this question and the need for a detailed study of:

(a) the various forms of aggression;
(b) the connection between a definition of aggression and the maintenance of international peace and security;
(c) the problems raised by the inclusion of a definition of aggression in the Code of Offences against the Peace and Security of Mankind and by its application within the framework of international criminal jurisdiction;
(d) the effect of a definition of aggression on the exercise of the jurisdiction of the various organs of the United Nations;
(e) any other problem which might be raised by a definition of aggression.

Considering that continued and joint efforts shall be made to formulate a generally acceptable definition of aggression, with a view to promoting international peace and security and developing international law, decides to establish a Special Committee of fifteen members and requests the said Special Committee:

(a) to submit to the General Assembly at its ninth session draft definitions of aggression or draft statements of the notion of aggression;
(b) to study all the problems referred to above on the assumption of a definition being adopted by a resolution of the General Assembly."

The concentrated research apparently revealed insurmountable difficulties, necessitating the adoption of this second resolution. The first resolution was emphatic in tone and intent. It assumed that a definition of aggression would *ipso facto* ensure international peace and security. The second resolution was more in step with realities of the international situation, in that it sought the exact connection between the definition of aggression and the maintenance of international peace and security. And, therefore, in view of the doubts engendered, the General Assembly requested the first Special Committee to enquire even further into the question.

The deliberations of the first Special Committee necessitated the formation of another Special Committee to co-ordinate the views expressed by state members and to submit to the eleventh session of the General Assembly:

1. a detailed report; and

2. a draft definition of aggression.

Among the three proposals submitted for a working plan of the second Special Committee, the Netherlands proposal suggested *inter alia,*

"To determine whether or not the outcome of these discussions warrants the drafting of a definition of aggression and, in case the answer is in the affirmative, to draft a definition of aggression."

This abundantly indicates that even at so late a stage of study, scepticism was apparent in the minds of some of the delegates on whether a definition of aggression was warranted.

It is, therefore, erroneous, in my delegation's view to submit that the General Assembly's resolution 599(VI) of January 31, 1952, has irrevocably settled that it is both possible and desirable to define aggression. If that were so the General Assembly would not have formed the Special Committee to consider this case and all its attendant implications at specialised levels. Indeed, the entire raison d'etre of creating the Special Committees would have become vitiated.

The report of the Special Committee on the question of defining aggression states that about twenty-six representatives considered a definition both possible and desirable but out of this category some representatives declared that they supported the adoption of a "generally acceptable definition" which, in fact, may be interpreted to mean that they opposed the idea of defining aggression, because "a generally acceptable definition" could not be found at the present time. Moreover, even these twenty-six representatives did not form what the report calls "a homogeneous group". They differed in opinion as to the function, the content, and the form of a definition. In other words, they were classified into one group solely on the ground that they agreed in principle to a principle, which carries the art of nebulousness to its apogee.

All this obviously shows that it is fundamentally wrong to hold that the resolution of the General Assembly of January 31, 1952, or any other resolution of that body on the subject has prejudiced the issue to the point where it can be pre-supposed that a definition of aggression is possible and desirable.

In this context, a resolution of the General Assembly is not an irrevocable and an unalterable edict. It is not a judgment of a court of last resort. Hence my delegation firmly believes it is not *ultra vires* of this discussion to consider if a definition of aggression is both possible and desirable.

Before entering into the substance of the issue, please allow me, Mr. Chairman, Sir, to conclude, so to speak, my *obiter dictal,* by saying that the most salutary aspect of this discussion is that the "End" or "Objective" of all gathered here is identical. That end is, if I may be permitted to take a slight liberty with the wording of the preamble, to save succeeding generations

from the scourge of aggression. All are sedulously seeking to find lasting guarantees for the ensurance of perpetual peace. This factor is of considerable significance. It establishes an indissoluble link. This spirit and unity of purpose may well be the most important single factor in the achievement of our aspirations.

On the first day of this debate, the distinguished and eminent Representative of Belgium referred to the miraculous achievements of modern science and felt, if I am correct, that this phenomenal progress is evidence of the undesirable fact that homo sapiens can attain his objective if he labours tenaciously and industriously to that end; and that it is imperative to keep our social sciences in rhythm with the development of world movements; else, our concepts and institutions will face the danger of becoming effete. This is true, but it is a double edged argument. If modern man can launch a sputnik, to use the terminology of the successor, into outer space, he can also define aggression. However, if man's ingenuity is limitless and if his resources and capabilities know no frontiers; then he is, and indeed must be, ingenious enough not only to define aggression but also to circumvent, subvert, and abuse it. A definition, under these circumstances, would literally mean the presentation of our civilization on a uranium platter to a would-be aggressor, to a twentieth century Gengis Khan or Attila; a would-be world dictator who would most certainly find the means to distort and mutilate the definition for his own wicked and gruesome ambitions.

Let us now examine, if under the present state of International Law's development, it is possible to define aggression. International Law has made tremendous strides since the far flung days of the ancient Greek City States era, and even since the relatively more recent time of Hugo Grotius. From a primitive law, dependent mainly on the sanction of self-help, it has developed into a body of recognized norms. It has institutionalised itself, and at Nuremberg, it asserted itself to that pitch of centralization which made it possible for it to take sanctions against individuals. Nonetheless, in comparison with the highly centralized and galvanized municipal law, it is still in its infancy. It does not have the force monopoly of the international community to enforce effectively all its sanctions. Its efficacy is entirely dependent upon the caprice of national sovereignty. In 1935, a decade before the auspicious gathering at San Francisco, that celebrated jurist Hans Kelsen characterized the status of International Law in words which, despite the substantial progress since achieved, to this day remains essentially the same; he said:

> "The present state of international law is characterized by the fact that international common law—considered from a technical standpoint—is still in the stage of a primitive system of law, that is to say, it is at a stage from which the legal system of the individual States originally

developed. This is a condition of extensive decentralization. There are not—as in a technically developed system of law—central organisms dividing among themselves the functions of making and executing law. The general rules valid for the whole community have not been consciously laid down by a legislator in an exact and regulated procedure, but—as in the beginning of the development of law within the individual State—they have been evolved by custom, that is to say, by the practice of the persons concerned with that law—the members of the community.

"Within the framework of international common law there are no central tribunals whose business it is to apply general rules of law to particular cases. A State injured by another State is the one to decide whether a violation of international law has taken place, and if the other State denies the breach which is imputed to it, there is, under international common law, no objective procedure by which the dispute can be determined. Thus the State whose rights are impugned itself retaliates at its own discretion for the wrong perpetrated, in its opinion, with the measures of coercion peculiar to international law, war or reprisal."

I hasten to admit that since 1935, International Law has developed by leaps and bounds. However, this notwithstanding, International Law, in marked contradistinction to municipal law, is still decentralized law, and the dichotomy between the two laws is enormous. I am aware of the International Court of Justice's existence but also of the subjective reservations of the states accepting its jurisdiction. I am aware of the existence of the Security Council and of its primary responsibility for the maintenance of peace and security, but I am also aware of article 27 (3) of the Charter, an article that looms over all matters of consequence.

My delegation deeply respects the Charter of the United Nations. However, my delegation believes that no disrespect is shown or intended to this august organization if reality is mirrored accurately. Here, my delegation is fortified by the erudite statement of the Foreign Secretary of the United Kingdom who, during the course of his brilliant speech on September 24, 1957, in the General Assembly said, and I quote:

"This debate is an appropriate opportunity for frank discussion of the state of the Organization—its achievements, its failures, its strength, its weaknesses, its standing in the world, the hopes for its development in the future.

"The United Nations is not a super-state. It is not a world authority enforcing its law upon the nations. The General Assembly is not a parliament of individually elected members legislating for the world. The United Nations is an instrument of negotiation between Governments. It can blunt the edges of conflict between nations. It can serve a diplomacy of reconciliation. Its tendency is to wear away or break down

differences and thus help towards solutions. In the Secretary-General's view, the real limitations upon the actions of the Organization do not derive from the provisions of the Charter or from the system of one vote for one nation irrespective of strength or size. They result from the facts of international life at the present time. The balance of forces in the world sets the limits within which the power of the world organization can develop."

These words represent reality so completely that even the most devout worshipper of the United Nations must accept them. For, to conceal such self-evident truth is to do an irredeemable disservice to the United Nations and the cause for which it stands.

There is no escape from the fact that International Law at the present moment bows at the altar of national sovereignty. Indeed the Charter itself is a political instrument. It is inevitable, therefore, that any discussion on the question of the definition of aggression must revolve around both political and legal issues, that is, on metajuristic considerations, on factors contaminated by the virus of subjective value judgment. In isolation, and on its own, the attempt to define aggression is, from a pragmatic standpoint, utterly futile.

It is an axiomatic fact that this endeavour cannot possibly be detached from socio-political influences. It gets inevitably recoiled in the web of politics. In these circumstances, are we to have two definitions of aggression, one political, and the other juridical? One based on the foundation of thermo-nuclear strength and the other, an analytical and objective definition, poised rather uncomfortably on the fragile edifice of an international legal tribunal functioning on the sufferance of national sovereignty? If that were to be permitted it would achieve for almost all times the ascendancy of politics over law. It would gravely endanger International Laws' struggle for the realization of its autonomy to enable it to establish permanent international peace through the rule of law; a system we cherish so dearly. Time and again, men of goodwill have solemnly appealed to sovereign states to submit their legal disputes to the International Court of Justice; but in spite of such pleadings, we find states resorting to other measures in the determination of disputes. In the present circumstances, such conduct is not really a matter for alarm or surprise. The Charter itself places the primary responsibility for the maintenance of international peace and security on a political organ of the United Nations. By virtue of article 94 (2) it places the International Court of Justice under the domain of politics. Article 94(2) states:

"If any party to a case fails to perform the obligations incumbent upon it under a judgment rendered by the Court, the other party may have recourse to the Security Council, which may, if it deems necessary,

make recommendations or decide upon measures to be taken to give effect to the judgment."

In support of my submission I would like to quote from Hans Kelsen's monumental treatise on the law of the United Nations:

"The Statute does not contain a provision guaranteeing the execution of the decisions of the Court against a recalcitrant State. Article 94(2) does not impose upon the Security Council the obligation to enforce the judgments of the Court against recalcitrant parties. It provides for a procedure of appeal in case of non-compliance with the judgment of the Court and makes the action of the Security Council to be taken as the result of the procedure dependent upon the council's discretion by authorising this body to choose between two different actions: Either to make recommendations or to decide upon measures to be taken to give effect to the judgment of the court. In case the Security Council chooses to make recommendations, it may recommend to comply with the judgment of the Court. But, in making a recommendation under Article 94(2), the Security Council is not bound to conform with the judgment of the Court with which the party concerned did not comply. The Security Council may recommend a solution of the dispute totally different from that decided by the Court. If Article 25 of the Charter is interpreted to apply to recommendations of the Security Council, recourse to the Security Council under Article 94(2) has the effect of an appeal to a higher authority. Even if it is assumed that recommendations made by the Security Council are not binding upon the parties, a recourse under Article 94(2) may have the effect of an appeal. For the Council may consider non-compliance with a recommendation made under Article 94(2), a threat to the peace and take enforcement action under Article 39 against the State which does not comply with the Council's recommendation. That means that the Security Council may enforce its recommendation instead of enforcing the Court's judgment. Article 94(2) confers upon the Security Council the power to substitute its recommendation for the Court's judgment. This means further, that the obligation imposed upon the Members by Article 94(1) and by the Statute of the Court: to comply with the decisions of the Court, may be restricted by application of Article 94(2). By having recourse to the Security Council under Article 94(2), the party places the Court under the control of the Council. Since under the Charter self-help (except in the case of an armed attack as self-defence) is prohibited, non-compliance with the Court's judgment may compel the other party to have recourse to the Security Council under Article 49(2). Such recourse may have the effect of transforming a legal dispute, decided by the Court in accordance with existing law, into an issue to be settled anew by the Council according to political

principles."

In these circumstances it would be the quintessence of irony to have only a legal definition of aggression, the interpretation of which may not even be determined by a juridical tribunal, and if determined, not enforced by it. A legal definition would acquire empirical utility only when the International Court assumes an exclusive jurisdiction over all disputes without exception and reservation. However, the international community will have to traverse quite a distance to reach this destination. That would be the first effective step to the super-state as it may be called in a legal sense, and not merely in the language of demi-gogic politics.

It would, therefore, be a melancholy defeat of the object of defining aggression if we were to try it at the present moment, at a time when it is not possible. It would mean the application of double standards to all international issues and the cruel incarceration of law by politics. Hence, my delegation fears that under the existing conditions of International Law, it is not possible to have a legal definition of aggression. It is only possible to have a political definition. Of course, it can be called legal but in effect, it will have a political connotation, emphasis, and outlook.

Even if my delegation were to concede that a legal definition is possible in a juridical sense, we would still be far away from the solution of the problem. We would immediately encounter a crisis of words, and get involved in an interminable semantic warfare. There would be disagreement on the scope, content, and function of the definition. Should it be in strict conformity with Article 51, or should it be a more comprehensive definition in which the expression "armed attack" as used in Article 51 is merely one form of aggression? Clarification and agreement will also be needed on Article 39 of the Charter, which speaks of "act of aggression". Would an "act of aggression" mean an armed attack only or would it mean aggression direct and indirect, aggression as envisaged by the Soviet draft resolution, in document A/C 6/L/399? A rigid and a limited definition may well defeat the object of defining aggression, and, on the other hand, an all-embracing definition including "aggressive intent", "the notion of indirect aggression", "the notion of economic aggression", "ideological aggression", and other forms of indirect aggression may create an anomalous state of affairs in which aggression may become a regular and normal feature of human conduct and thereby lose its dreadfully abnormal, fearful, and emergent meaning. From an abnormal notion it would be turned into a natural notion. This half-exhausted twentieth century is in the grips of the most dramatic ideological battle. In every part of the world there is a clash of ideas, ideas that cannot be easily controlled or liquidated. In so pregnant a setting, ideological aggression can be detected in almost every area of the globe. Normalcy would be characterized by the word

aggression if ideological aggression were to form a part of it. However, basically, a definition, whether narrow or broad is without an obol of doubt, explosively loaded with far-reaching implications, and is fraught with a host of dangers.

Assuming a definition is possible, is it desirable? A definition's immediate effect would be to stultify and hamper the progressive growth of International Law. In this respect, my delegation noted with approval the distinguished representative of Ceylon's reference to the Law of Torts, when he made his lucid statement during the course of the discussion on the Report of the International Law Commission.

Because of the enormous dichotomy in the degree of centralization, the only branch of Municipal Law that can be profitably compared with International Law is the Law of Torts. Like General International Law, the Law of Torts is in a stage of dynamic growth. If the Law of Torts had been codified at a premature juncture, an irreparable harm would have been done to the province of jurisprudence as a whole. The Tort of Negligence would not have emerged and bloomed to its fullness. Out of the historic judgment of Lord Atkin in Donohue v. Stevenson emerged not only a Tort of Negligence but also a philosophy of law establishing beyond all reasonable doubt, the virtue of undefined norms. "The categories of negligence are never closed", said the sagacious law Lord, and so it truly was; with the result that redress and relief is now readily available to all who suffer and groan physically and financially for the negligence of their fellow citizens. If the Law of Torts had been stultified and cramped within the four walls of a definition, it would not have been possible for thousands of individuals to seek and receive relief according to their due. And certainly it would not have been possible for the distinguished representative of India to extend the Principle of the General Duty of Care to the ambit of International Law and argue, as he rightly did, that the principle enunciated in Donohue v. Stevenson imposes a duty of care on every state in its international conduct.

The virtue of undefined legal terms has been well described by an eminent American authority and to summarize the thought of my delegation in this respect, it would perhaps be beneficial to quote an extract from the Supreme Court's decision in Davidson v. Board of Administrators of the City of New Orleans (96. U.S. 97 1878 p. 103, 104) for in this case the Supreme Court expressed its reluctance to define the exact meaning of the term "Due Process" for much the same reasons that compel us to shy away from a definition of aggression. I now quote the relevant passage:—

> ". . . if, therefore, it were possible to define what it is for a State to deprive a person of life, liberty, or property without due process of law, in terms which would cover every exercise of power thus forbidden to

the State, and exclude those which are not, no more useful construction could be furnished by this or any other court to any part of the fundamental law. But, apart from the imminent risk of a failure to give any definition which would be at once perspicuous, comprehensive and satisfactory, there is wisdom . . . in the ascertaining of the intent and application of such an important phase in the Federal Constitution, by the gradual process of judicial inclusion and exclusion, as the cases presented for decision shall require . . ."

If it is wise to keep the door open for the development of law in the highly centralized system of Municipal Law by avoiding a priori definitions, how much more wise and beneficial it would be to emulate this policy in the highly decentralized system of International Law. Are we so certain, so dogmatically committed to the belief that the categories of aggression are closed and therefore fit for definition?

Those nurtured in the system of the Common Law have seen through experience the inherent weaknesses of defined terms. It is true that even in countries where the Common Law prevails, the dictates of modern society have compelled to some extent the codification of laws. No effort has, however, been made to codify laws that are in the process of development. The Common Law countries present an excellent opportunity for judging simultaneous and side by side the workings of both codified and uncodified laws in one legal framework. Suffice it to say that codification gives rise to a host of new problems, particularly those pertaining to interpretation. Most certainly it is no automatic machine that produces the required results on the insertion of the proper coin. At times not infrequent it gives rise to problems far more complicated and difficult than those that existed prior to codification.

Law is a coercive order. This is a characteristic of law recognized from time immemorial. Without the element of force, law is reduced to naught, instead of maintaining order it becomes a part of anarchy. For this very reason it is not infrequently asked if International Law is true law. If International Law possesses the ingredients of coercion, it is true law; if it can take effective remedial and prohibitive sanctions against civil and criminal delicts, it is true law. As the distinguished Representative of Colombia so aptly said, and I quote, "There could be no society without law, and no law without penalties".

Those who regard International Law as true law consider that the most effective and potent sanction of International Law is WAR, both defensive and aggressive. According to the protagonists of this school of thought, the theory of *bellum justum* is an inextricable part of International Law. My delegation does not express any views on the merits of this theory. We only say that it is necessary to reckon with this theory and its mani-

fold implications, if we are to define and declare aggression an international crime. A situation may arise, as has happened so often in the past, calling for the application of this doctrine. The theory of Just War is not confined to the right of self-defence. Aggressive collective action is conceivable. "Counter-war" is the only effective reaction against an unpermitted war. If war is a delict, counter-war must be a sanction. The theory of *bellum justum* fell into eclipse during the era of unbridled and unfettered national sovereignty. But, once again, it is reasserting itself in the field of International Law. So argue those who subscribe to this theory. They also say that it forms the basis of many important landmarks in Positive International Law, such as the Peace Treaty of Versailles, the Covenant of the League of Nations, and the Kellogg Pact. It is even traceable in Article 51 of the Charter.

This doctrine creates complications of very great magnitude not so much in the exercise of legitimate self-defence measures but when aggression, technically so-called, becomes necessary or is thought necessary as a sanction of International Law. History is studded with a plethora of cases that blur the line between measures of self-defence and unmitigated aggression. Legitimate exercise of the right of self-defence and aggression are concomitantly interwoven. The latest instance of this is epitomized in the Korean conflict. Each party accused the other of aggression and each claimed that it was exercising the inherent right of self-defence, although aggression was so manifestly clear that the United Nations were able to take peremptory measures.

A situation may arise in which State A accuses State B of organizing or encouraging the organization of armed bands within its territory or of subversive infiltration and on this pretence, in the exercise of its inherent right of self-defence, attacks and subdues State B. In such an event, the victim may appeal to another state or states, either under treaty obligations or under the rules of General International Law, to come to its rescue. Interference by other states would technically constitute aggression against State A. This notwithstanding, the intervention would be a just resort to counter-aggression against State A.

The distinguished Representative of Colombia has stated, as an instance of indirect aggression against France and the United Kingdom, the German attack on Poland in 1939. This may be one interpretation of the chain of events that unleashed the Second World War. The proponents of the doctrine of *bellum justum* would, however, interpret the declaration of war by the United Kingdom on Nazi Germany as an act of just aggression against a violator of International Law.

It may be argued that under prevailing conditions, a state cannot abuse its right of self-defence beyond a given limit. The latter part of Article

51 of the Charter would be an effective bar against the abuse. This argument, if advanced, would be found wanting in actual practice. For, in such a contingency, the veto right may have the opposite effect. Instead of preventing action, or counter-action, it would thwart the cessation of hostilities, once hostilities have started in the case of an abused exercise of the right of self-defence.

In view of the possibility of the occurrence of such abuses under the existing conditions of International Law and without a radical amendment or revision of the Charter, is it really desirable to classify aggression as an international crime? A crime forbidding counter-aggression on occasions when civilized nations are bound ethically and legally to fulfil their solemn obligations of individual and collective action against the misdeeds of a naked aggressor, an aggressor who vainly and shamelessly, seeks to conceal his aggression behind the facade of the abused right of self-defence. International Law would be relegated to a set of empty norms if its most effective coercive sanction is so circumscribed.

Hence, it is my delegation's concerted view that at this rather critical juncture, it is neither possible nor desirable to define aggression. Furthermore, we believe that we have the machinery, competent, capable, and mobile enough to take appropriate corrective action against aggressive acts, against other breaches of the peace, the threats to the peace, and all other disputes and situations endangering international peace and security, without defining aggression. On the contrary, a definition may quite conceivably act as a barrier against quick and decisive counter-action, and bog down the proceedings of the Security Council by a prolonged and futile discussion on the niceties of interpreting facts. As a definition would inevitably entail a drastic revision and amendment of the Charter, perhaps it may be more opportune to explore the possibility and necessity of a definition at the time when the revision of the Charter comes up for consideration.

My delegation has voiced its apprehensions *vis-a-vis* the possibility and desirability of defining aggression. However, as Pakistan is incontrovertably dedicated to the cause of peace, it is a fundamental tenet of our policy to approach all issues impartially. My delegation does not harbour any preconceived prejudices. Issues of such paramount importance cannot be tackled in a dogmatic and doctrinaire manner. We have indicated the more apparent, or what may appear to us to be the more apparent, impediments in the path of a definition. But if even one out of this galaxy of jurists is able to dispel our doubts, we are quite prepared to examine sympathetically and objectively the suggestions and proposals made to that effect. Society is composed of far too many imponderables for there to be a finality of decision on such questions.

However, with this qualification my delegation must state categorically

that despite the fast changing pattern of human activity, there are certain immutable factors. My delegation is fully aware of the character and function of this Committee albeit it cannot be denied that on occasions the terms of reference of the various committees overlap. The question under consideration is not exclusively a legal issue. That it is part legal and part political is an incontestable proposition. If it were strictly a legal issue it would not have caused so much perplexity. By its very nature, it brings to the fore political and even socio-economic problems. But even strictly legal issues involve the legitimate discussion of facts. However, in deference to the apparent sense and feeling of this Committee, my delegation will state in general terms a matter of fundamental concern to my country.

If there is a generally acceptable definition of aggression, if we are to close the categories of aggression, that definition must include economic aggression. In this respect, paragraph 3 (a) and (c) of the Soviet draft resolution is not specific enough to dispel the fears of my delegation. If we are to adopt a definition, then that definition must contain a separate article on economic aggression stating clearly and unambiguously that economic aggression or indirect aggression is perpetrated if lower riparians are deprived of their natural rights in use of rivers which flow through two or more countries. My delegation cannot overstate the importance of this issue.

An armed attack is gruesome and odious because of the damage it inflicts. Hence, everyone agrees that an armed attack is aggression, pure and simple. If more devastating and deadly damage to life and property can be inflicted without an armed attack, without the use of force, by means far more callous and perfidious, then such means must constitute a part of aggression as much as an armed attack.

If there is any interference in the normal and assured supply of irrigation waters, my country would face the threat of total annihilation. It would be the most invidious form of aggression. It would turn green alluvial and fertile fields into a scorching desert. It would create wide-spread famine, frustration, and fear. It would make it virtually impossible for any authority to control civil strife and bloodshed. Starvation would compel civilized human beings to resort to cannibalism. It would shatter all concepts of decency and morality. This indeed would be the outcome of such an aggression.

This is a situation not peculiar to my country. There are other states that, due to their geographical position and their economic reliance on supply of irrigation waters from an international river must take cognizance of such a form of aggression.

Economic blockade of land-locked countries may, likewise, have similar results and, therefore, my delegation will support the proposal of the

distinguished Representative of Afghanistan made in this connection provided there is a generally acceptable definition of aggression and provided on merit, my country's great neighbours recognize our legitimate fears and are prepared to admit that violation of riparian rights can cause as much if not more economic havoc as an economic blockade of a land-locked country. There could be no better demonstration of my delegation's bonafides than this voluntary acceptance of facts based on merits.

I have taxed a great deal of your time and patience but before I close I must appeal to you, my distinguished colleagues, that we must strive tirelessly and continuously for the search of the necessary political equilibrium and adjustments guaranteeing the maintenance of perpetual peace. This is a duty we owe not only to our own warsick generation, but to our progeny. We are imbounded by our Charter not only to save ourselves, but also the succeeding generations from the scourge and carnage of war. I have often heard it said that in the event of world conflagration, there will be neither victor nor vanquished. This seems obvious, but even if there is a sham and farcical victory, it will be that of the dying over the dead, and the dying will have the dubious thrill of glory by witnessing the utter demolition of civilization; the destruction of our homes and universities, our centres of art and science, our mosques and temples and churches, our Taj Mahals and Westminster Abbeys; and among the wailing of orphaned infants and crippled widows, the victors will breathe their last breath. So it is our sacred duty to work for a lasting peace and to give a ring of reality and not merely that of hope to the words of an English poet who visualised the day—

> "... when the war drums beat no longer and the battle flags are furled, in a Parliament of Man, in a federation of the World ..."

Address to the First Committee of the United Nations General Assembly on October 28, 1959

Mr. Chairman,

We are carrying into the fourteenth year of the life of the United Nations our discussions on disarmament. Solutions to the problem have so far eluded us. The perfection of nuclear weapons and the development of rockets and satellites, while lending even greater urgency to the problem, have interposed what appear to be insurmountable barriers to its solution.

To these deep frustrations has been added the two year deadlock on both the procedure and substance of disarmament negotiations. Unmoved by the mortal danger to the human race from the fierce competition in the accumulation of new weapons the great powers have not shown that awareness of time which is of such critical importance in the problem.

It is, therefore, with no small measure of relief that we welcome the break in the double deadlock which makes it possible to discuss the substantive aspects of disarmament in the Ten-Power negotiating committee, set up as a result of the decision of the Foreign Ministers of the Four Great Powers.

We note that the Committee will present reports on its work to the United Nations Disarmament Commission, and through it to the General Assembly and the Security Council, in recognition of the ultimate responsibility for general disarmament measures vested in the United Nations by its Charter.

The distinguished Representative of the United Kindgom has suggested that it would be appropriate if the Secretary-General were to appoint a representative at the proceedings of the Ten-Power group. We endorse this suggestion, as it will establish a direct link between the United Nations and the Ten-Power group which was established outside the framework

of the organization.

In this context, the Pakistan delegation warmly welcomes the proposal of the distinguished Representative of Greece that the Chairman of the Disarmament Commission, Ambassador Padilla Nervo, should represent the United Nations at the meetings of the Ten-Power Committee. Both by virtue of his personal qualifications and the office he holds, the distinguished Permanent Representative of Mexico would be the most suitable choice for this purpose.

The proposals for general and complete disarmament of all states, outlined to the General Assembly on September 18 by Prime Minister Khrushchev, and the scheme of comprehensive disarmament submitted by the Foreign Secretary of the United Kingdom, Mr. Selwyn Lloyd, a day earlier, promise, in the view of my delegation, the prospect of further loosening of the deadlock which has existed among the great powers, on the substantive aspects of the disarmament question, since the twelfth session of the General Assembly. The two sets of proposals may well open real possibilities of agreement between the Western Powers and the Soviet Union on important measures of disarmament. We feel uplifted by new hopes of significant progress towards the ultimate objective of a disarmed and war-less world—an objective which all nations and all peoples must attain by their collective efforts if they are to escape from the ultimate catastrophe which the arms race portends.

The Pakistan delegation agrees with the distinguished Representative of Argentina that the Soviet and British proposals should be examined in the first instance by the Ten-Power group. We hope that every effort will be made by this body to resolve differences and to envolve an agreed plan embodying the greatest possible measure of controllable disarmament to be implemented in stages. The Members of the United Nations will best be able to evaluate the merits of the stands of the Western Powers and the Soviet Union after the report of the group is transmitted to the Disarmament Commission. At the present time, neither of the two plans has been set forth in such fullness as to enable the First Committee to do more than make observations of a general nature in regard to them, and the views expressed by the parties primarily concerned at this stage.

Even a cursory comparison of the two plans reveals marked progress in the thinking of the two sides, as compared with that reflected in the discussions of the Sub-Committee of the Disarmament Commission in 1957. In this respect, the following advances from previous positions must be regarded as significant :

First, the reinstatement of comprehensive disarmament by both sides as the objective of negotiations in the place of partial measures ;

Second, the implicit abandonment by the West of its insistence on

linking progress in the reduction of armed forces and conventional disarmament to political conditions and to the preliminary solution of certain political problems ;

Third, the loosening of the Western 'package' proposals making it possible to implement individual measures of disarmament which may be agreed upon without making this dependent upon implementation of other disarmament measures in the whole complex ;

Fourth, the abandonment by the Soviet Union of its demand for the renunciation of the use of atomic and hydrogen weapons before any start can be made with conventional disarmament ;

Fifth, the relegation by the Soviet Union of its demand for the abolition of foreign military bases from priority status to the stage when conventional disarmament is complete.

These, we believe, are definite forward steps towards the goal of disarmament, whether total or partial.

On the question of an inspection and control system, which must always remain the keystone of the structure, it is not possible at the present moment to say to what degree the respective positions may be expected to converge. The statements of the Soviet representatives on this all important aspect of the problem have been generally construed as implying that a control body is to be established in the third and final phase of disarmament and that complete inspection will be permitted only after major steps in disarmament are already accomplished.

The clarification given by the distinguished Representative of the Soviet Union in his intervention yesterday should dispel our fears that this may in fact be the real thinking of the Soviet Union. He expressed himself in favour of control being commensurate with concrete actions on disarmament. We hope we are correct in taking it that the Soviet proposals envisage the effective enforcement of inspection and control over every step of actual disarmament from the first to the last stage. The new emphasis on effective and comprehensive controls, which we find in the Soviet statements, has raised our expectations of a meeting of minds between the great powers on this question which has so far kept them wide apart. Would it be too much to hope that now at last the Soviet Union may be prepared to elaborate, with the same boldness that characterises its proposals for general and complete disarmament, the responsibilities, functions, rights and powers of the control organ appropriate to each stage of disarmament?

It is only then that all parties will be able to judge whether the controls to be instituted will be real and not illusory.

It will be the task of the Ten-Power Committee to work out comprehensive measures of international inspection and control to be applied to the

extent necessary to each phase of an agreed disarmament plan that it may be possible to evolve from the proposals of Mr. Khrushchev and Mr. Selwyn Lloyd.

We are assured by the Western Powers that they will not take up firm positions in regard to their own proposals without giving time for patient consideration and that they are prepared to take equal steps together, large or small, toward comprehensive or partial disarmament. The Soviet Union, for its part, has expressed its readiness to consider amendments to its own plan and to discuss other proposals.

This openmindedness augurs well for the forthcoming negotiations. If the spirit of compromise rules the talks, it should not prove an insurmountable task to iron out the differences which remain and integrate the two sets of proposals into a single balanced plan of comprehensive and controlled disarmament, to be implemented by stages in such a manner that at no stage will one side be placed in a situation of relative military advantage over the other—in other words, a plan that would ensure that each step in disarmament will enhance the security of not only of one of the parties, but of all the parties.

As Pakistan is not a member of the Ten-Power group, my delegation would like to take advantage of this opportunity to make a few observations on certain provisions of the Soviet as well as the British proposals.

In respect of the former, my colleague, the Foreign Minister of Pakistan, Mr. Manzur Qadir, stated as follows in his statement to the General Assembly on September 25:

> "The record of the disarmament negotiations shows that a control system to ensure the complete elimination of stockpiles of nuclear weapons of mass destruction is not yet feasible. If it be true that any kind of inspection which it may be possible to agree upon in this field would leave a margin of error which would expose one side to the risk of evasion by the other, it would seem that the prospects of total disarmament are not nearer than before. In that case, it would be more realistic to proceed to negotiate initially on the basis of comprehensive disarmament outlined to us by the British Foreign Secretary, Mr. Selwyn Lloyd, last week. The scope of the negotiations could then be enlarged to include complete and general disarmament with the development of techniques to bring the question of hidden nuclear stockpiles within the range of detection and control."

The United Kingdom plan is based upon the principle that measures of conventional and nuclear disarmament must be related and proceed hand in hand so that when nuclear disarmament deprives the West of its nuclear deterrent, the Soviet Union may not retain its heavy preponderance in conventional armaments. None can take exception to the principle

that disarmament measures, whether conventional or nuclear, should be so carried out as not to upset the present military balance between the great powers.

The fact, however, that the Khrushchev proposals do not contemplate restrictions on nuclear arms in the first and second stages and concentrate on the reduction and liquidation of armed forces and conventional armaments should not, in the view of my delegation, detract from their merits or be regarded as conflicting with the basic principle of maintaining intact the balance of power while disarmament is taking place. If the side which has the advantage in conventional armaments is willing to forego it, without making this conditional upon the other party giving up its superiority in nuclear weapons, surely such a proposal can in no manner have the effect of altering the balance of strength to the disadvantage of the other party.

For this reason, we consider that the constructive elements in the Khrushchev proposals for the reduction of armed forces and conventional armaments should not be lost sight of. They may well hold out the prospect of a substantial measure of real disarmament in the near future.

It was with this hope in mind that the Pakistan Foreign Minister expressed himself as follows on this aspect of disarmament in his statement of September 25:

> "....We would venture to suggest that the Ten-Power Committee should make every effort to reach agreement on the reduction of the armed forces and conventional armaments of the great powers and also give consideration to the convening of a special session of the General Assembly within two years to effect a reduction of the standing armies and armaments of all other member states to appropriate levels."

The Pakistan delegation hopes that the Ten-Power Committee will give consideration to the convening of such a conference.

It was the stand of the Western Powers in the negotiations in 1957 that conventional disarmament cannot be limited in the later stages to the four principal powers, but that other essential states should also accept reduced levels for their forces and armaments. We believe that while the relaxation of this position should facilitate the forth-coming negotiations between the great powers, the principle of limitation of armed forces and armaments must be made universally applicable so as to include the great as well as the small powers by means of a multilateral convention, which would also ensure that the security of all states parties is thereby not impaired but enhanced in relation to one another.

In regard to the four-year period within which general and complete disarmament is to be carried out, we doubt whether it would be realistic, in the light of past experience, to expect that this kind of disarmament

can be carried out in the manner of a crash programme. When, in the case of such peripheral issues as the discontinuance of testing, a whole year has not proved sufficient for the conclusion of an agreement, is it not too much to hope that all those formidable difficulties that lie at the heart of the central problem can be resolved within a period of 4 years. If the Soveit Union can demonstrate its ability to conclude an agreement on the discontinuance of testing before the end of the present session of the General Assembly, our skepticism will yield to rising expectations of attaining the objective of total disarmament within this time limit.

The economic burden of rising military expenditures, in consequence of the arms race, bears heavily on all the peoples of the world. It is having the result of increasing taxes and reducing the percentages of national budgets devoted to health, education and social welfare. Even the two colossi among the great armed Powers must recognize that the inexorable necessity to develop and maintain competing weapons-systems to ensure the operational maturity of one of them at any given moment, and also the means of defence against them ultimately, must lead to mutual bankruptcy and exhaustion.

For many of the smaller nations, the cost of their military establishments is becoming prohibitive, draining away 50 to 60 per cent of their annual revenues.

A reduction of armaments is the only hope which these countries have of economic viability and especially those among them which are under-developed. They cannot reduce their armaments unless corresponding reductions are made in the military strengths of their neighbours. They do not possess nuclear weapons. For them, therefore, meaningful disarmament connotes a general and universal reduction of conventional armaments so as to release enough of their own economic and financial resources for the purpose of attaining a rate of growth which will carry them forward from their present stage of low productivity to that of the "take off" when economic development tends to become self-generating.

The present rate of flow of foreign assistance from all sources, governmental, private as well as from the international agencies, is inadequate to carry the under-developed countries to this critical stage. The incidence of this assistance is to a large extent purely compensatory, as the terms of trade have moved steeply against under-developed countries, mainly because of the fall and fluctuations in the prices of primary commodities. Given their present military expenditures, it would require 3 to 4 times the current rate of annual foreign assistance over the period of a decade to enable them to achieve self-sustaining economies.

Unless general, multilateral and enforceable disarmament is accomplished, the under-developed countries will not acquire the means from either

domestic or foreign sources to meet the challenge of the revolution of rising aspirations of their poverty-stricken peoples.

The distinguished Representative of the United States, Mr. Cabot Lodge, has rightly pointed out that if all nations lay down their arms, there must be institutions to preserve international peace and security and promote the rule of law.

A number of delegations have spoken on the means of dealing with the new situation that would emerge following the adoption of a plan of comprehensive disarmament. Among them, the distinguished Representatives of Argentina, Italy, Japan, Netherlands and Greece have made constructive suggestions to prevent aggression, protect small states, safeguard against violations of a disarmament treaty, strengthen the machinery of peaceful settlement of disputes and the International Court of Justice and for these ends, to study the political, legal and constitutional issues concerning the organization of the international community in a world without arms.

The Pakistan delegation welcomes and supports the proposals of the United States that the Disarmament Commission should study the three questions which it has formulated to enable us to meet the challenge of what we hope will be a new era in international relations.

Pakistan has always been a staunch supporter of the concept of an international police force to preserve world peace and security. We have also on several occasions urged that the charter machinery for the peaceful settlement of disputes should be strengthened and the scope of compulsory jurisdiction of the International Court enlarged to make our organization a more effective instrument for the attainment of its purposes.

What we are seeking to do on the question of disarmament is without precedent in human history.

> "New relationships of forces are reshaping the world. The search is for methods by which nations can accommodate themselves to living with each other in the new and more dangerous world. The achievement of this peaceful accommodation presently is more difficult than the conquest of space."

This is the challenge before us.

Address to the Second Committee of the United Nations General Assembly on November 11, 1959

Mr. Chairman,

May I begin by congratulating our distinguished Under-Secretary for Economic and Social Affairs, Mr. Philippe de Seynes, for his extremely lucid and penetrating appraisal of the problem of economic development of the under-developed countries.

My delegation has also read with deep interest the report presented by the Secretary-General to the Economic and Social Council, analysing the various suggestions and proposals made in the United Nations economic bodies during the recent years on topics relating to economic development, such as primary commodities and international commodity trade, the development of resources, industrialization, technical assistance, financing, etc. I may say that we find ourselves in general agreement, both with the analysis and the conclusions of the Secretary-General, as well as with the recommendations made by the Economic and Social Council to intensify development efforts.

Mr. Chairman, all these statements and analyses, all the conclusions and recommendations serve to highlight the following broad features of the situation:

(*a*) the vast magnitude and complexity of the problem;

(*b*) the close inter-dependence of the developed and the under-developed countries in this context; and

(*c*) the urgency of finding appropriate solutions to these problems.

I do not propose to embark upon a detailed survey of the factors which go to make up what is undoubtedly a depressing picture of the present economic situation and the even gloomier long-term prospects of under-developed countries. Other speakers before me have no doubt adequately

dealt with the subject. Moreover, I understand that this Committee is working against time. I would, therefore, confine myself to a few observations emphasizing the urgency of finding solutions to our problems.

Mr. Chairman, no one who has taken a moderately intelligent interest in the contemporary history of the post-war years, can fail to recognize the vital role that the under-developed countries have come to play in the complex of international relations. This importance is not due only to the fact that an overwhelmingly large percentage of world's population lives in these areas, nor even because they form a majority of membership in this great world organization, but mainly because they represent enormous "power vacuums". When rival economic systems are advertising their wares, these vast populations stand fascinated and expectant at the threshold of a glorious tomorrow; but they also stand extremely perplexed. In this posture, one false step from any one of them and the world could be plunged into devastating conflict.

It is true that at present the statesmen of the leading nations are striving to bring about a relaxation of tension by limiting armaments. This must not, however, be allowed to lull us into a false sense of security, for, disarmament, even if it should be achieved, will not by itself remove the deeper causes of war. One of the root causes of war is the economic disequilibrium in the world. We think that as long as these dangerous vacuums of power, these yawning chasms of grinding poverty, ill-health and ignorance remain unbridged, all hopes of a lasting peace in our times must prove chimerical. And, be it noted that while these negotiations go on, time will not be standing still in the under-developed countries. If things do not go forward, they must go backwards; such is the inexorable law of life. Strong and compelling pressures are constantly building up within these countries for better or for worse, pressures which will not be resisted for long. During the last 18 months, a number of regimes in Asia and Africa, including that in my country, have been swept away because they were not able to respond effectively to these pressures. The weak and fumbling regimes have been replaced by politically strong and stable ones which appear to be well equipped for setting the course of these countries on the right track. For example, my country's government has, within a very short period of time, launched a number of far-reaching programmes of reform and has already succeeded in reshaping the pattern of our internal political, economic and social life. We are determined to overcome all obstacles in our way to progress so far as it lies in our power. But there are things which do not lie in our power. Among them the most important are the international economic forces. They are beyond our control and yet they have a most powerful impact on the lives of each one of us. If these economic forces continue to act unfavourably, people in these

countries may well begin asking themselves the question: "What next?" And who, Mr. Chairman, can answer it today.

Now, Mr. Chairman, let us look at these problems a little more closely. A basic problem of economic development of the under-developed countries is that of finding adequate investment. The rate of domestic savings is too low and even what there is, is swallowed up by the enormous rate of population increase. The introduction of measures to control growth of population in itself requires considerable investment in raising educational as well as general standards of living. Here we come face to face with one of the several vicious circles with which our problem is hemmed in. To break it we need international assistance and, indeed, this has been forthcoming in generous measure, both bilaterally and multi-laterally. Nevertheless, the problem still remains. The role of the United Nations is to devise effective measures to combat whatever may be obstructing the realization of our aims.

As my delegation sees it, the central problem of under-developed countries can be examined in three different aspects, as, indeed, it has been in the past. First, we must ask ourselves if the means at present available to finance economic development are sufficient, and, if not, to find out more effective ways and means of increasing international flow of private and public capital to under-developed countries. Secondly, there is the question of adequacy or otherwise of means to make available the necessary measure of technical assistance to these countries in order to raise the low level of the skills of the population. Lastly, there is the paradoxical problem created by the dependence of under-developed countries on exports of primary commodities, the prices of which have not only fallen but fluctuated widely, while the prices of industrial manufactures have continued to rise steadily.

With regard to the availability of finance, Mr. Chairman, my delegation is happy to note that a new multilateral organization, the International Development Association, is being brought into being shortly as an adjunct of the International Bank. We believe that this new institution with its programme of "soft" loans will fill a much needed place in the existing pattern of international assistance programmes. It is, however, too early to form any definite assessment of its scope of activities. Judging from the initial proposed capital it seems that the loans to be given by the International Development Association would go only part of the way in meeting the needs of the under-developed countries. For this reason my delegation feels that there is still a place for a United Nations Capital Development Fund, the creation of which we have always supported. Apart from certain inherent psychological advantages that a universal Fund of this kind, operated under the aegis of the United Nations, possesses, my delegation feels that it would enable those nations to make their contribution

to international economic co-operation which, for reasons of policy or scruple, do not find themselves able to participate in the newly formed International Development Association.

The situation of the flow of private international investment into the under-developed countries remains unsatisfactory despite the fact that most of the countries concerned have considerably liberalized their fiscal and industrial policies to make them more attractive to foreign investors. My own country, for example, has provided several new incentives and facilities for foreign investors. One of the important concessions is that participation of local capital in any fixed proportion is no longer insisted upon. Bilateral agreements for avoidance of double income-tax have been concluded with many countries. The mining industry has been granted a special tax relief. An Investment Promotion Bureau has been set up by the Central Government with branches in both the Provinces for providing the fullest possible information and assistance to 'foreign investors'.

My delegation is also pleased to note that in the last few years significant progress has been made in the sphere of rendering technical assistance to the under-developed countries, both as regards the availability of funds and the improvements of institutional machinery for international action. It is needless to stress how desperately the under-developed countries stand in need of industrialization. Whatever brings this objective nearer to realization is worthy of our whole-hearted support. The recently created United Nations Special Fund has been rightly described as "a strategic break-through of incomparable significance" for economic development. It has an important role to play, especially in infra-structure improvements and in building up the capacity for absorption for capital in the under-developed countries. Equally gratifying has been the role played in the last few years by the Expanded Programme of Technical Assistance. It must, however, be stated that the availability of funds for both the Special Fund and Expanded Programme of Technical Assistance falls short of the minimum needs.

This, Mr. Chairman, brings me to the last and in the view of my delegation, the most important aspect of all, namely, that relating to the instability of commodity prices. For, upon a satisfactory solution of this problem depends our most reliable and effective instrument of economic development, namely, the capacity of the under-developed countries themselves to contribute to their own development. No lasting success can be achieved in the field of economic growth unless and until, as the report of the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development has pointed out, the under-developed countries are enabled to mobilize their own capital resources. In any case, we cannot go on relying indefinitely upon international assistance as a permanent feature of our economic life.

The capacity of the under-developed countries to contribute to their own development depends largely on their export earnings as the plant and machinery and the technical facilities required for the purpose of development have to be imported from industrialized countries. The under-developed countries have, under the present circumstances, to rely on the sale of their primary commodities for their export earnings. It is a matter of considerable concern to us that the returns on the sale abroad of primary commodities have diminished very considerably over the last several years. This fact has been brought out emphatically in almost every survey of world economic conditions. I shall limit myself to inviting attention, by way of illustration, to the fact that the fall in the price index of primary commodities in the course of one single year from mid-1957 to mid-1958 has reduced export earnings of the under-developed countries by about 8% representing a loss in their import capacity equivalent to about six years' loans to them by the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development at the 1956-57 levels. It may also be pertinent to mention here that in the case of my own country, the total financial aid which we have received from different sources uptil now, has been less than half of the total loss which we have suffered on account of the fall in the price of our primary commodities.

The situation created by the wide-spread decline in the price of primary commodities has been aggravated by a rise in the price of manufactured goods thus reducing still further the ability of the under-developed countries to procure the means of their economic progress. This again is a phenomenon well recognized in all economic appraisals. Every under-developed country must have felt the frustrating consequences of the combination of these two vital economic factors on their efforts to improve the standards of their people. In Pakistan, the purchasing power of the export value of our primary commodities is today a little less than 50% of what it was in 1948 and 1949.

May I, Mr. Chairman, add that the future as one can see it today, does not hold prospects of any improvement in the present situation. All trends indicate that the cost of manufactured goods in the industrialized countries will, mainly because of the wage increases and other social benefits, continue to rise, that the manufacture of substitutes will continue to reduce the demand for primary commodities and that the demand of the under-developed countries for manufactured goods, in order to increase their production of primary commodities and industrial products in keeping with the increase in population, will continue to rise. These premises cannot but lead to the widening of the gap between the standards of living of the people of the under-developed countries and those of the industrialized countries. The extremity of such consequences can be judged from the estimate that even

today, no less than 1,362 million inhabitants out of a total of 1,800 million, living in under-developed countries, have a per capita income of $8 per month as compared to the $9 per day in the highly industrialized countries.

It is gratifying to observe that the acuteness and magnitude of the problem has been well appreciated by the various bodies dealing with economic problems under the aegis of the United Nations. The Commission on International Commodity Trade and the Interim Co-ordinating Committee for International Commodity Arrangements have undertaken studies on the subject. Recommendations have been made that the industrialized countries should abolish import duties on primary commodities and do away with all protective measures and import restrictions with regard to primary commodities. My delegation fully supports these recommendations. It has been suggested that the best approach to solve the problem is by way of dealing with each commodity separately and through bilateral agreements between exporting and importing countries. The setting up of buffer stocks has also been considered as a measure conducive to stabilization of prices. These are no doubt useful suggestions but experience has shown that, by themselves, these measures cannot provide the answer to the rapidly deteriorating situation confronting us.

In the opinion of my delegation, Mr. Chairman, it is essential that the problem must be faced in its entirety and with a sense of urgency that the circumstances call for. A thorough analysis should be made of the causes that affect the return to the producer of primary commodities. Remedial measures would necessarily have to be of a short term and a long term character. It will be essential to introduce, with the minimum loss of time, a diversification in the production of under-developed countries. The achievement of this end calls for considerable foreign exchange resources to be available to those countries. While we search for long-term solutions, it is of the greatest importance that we should find immediate means of enabling the under-developed countries to sustain their economic progress at some reasonable level. Such resources are, as I have brought out earlier, being depleted by the adverse balance in terms of trade of the under-developed countries. My delegation is of the view that the serious situation facing us demands the creation of a Compensatory Fund to counter-balance the shortfall in the earnings of the primary producers *vis-a-vis* the industrial countries. We visualise that disbursements from such a fund would be limited to extreme fluctuations of prices so as not to disturb the ordinary pattern of international trade with its normal margins of fluctuations. Necessary precautions will also need to be incorporated in the rules of administration of the fund to ensure that the scheme of compensation does not encourage uneconomic production in countries exporting primary commodities.

May I add that the proposal now made is not altogether a new one. It

only seeks to give definite shape to an idea which has been examined and supported by economic experts. The committee of five experts appointed by the Secretary-General under General Assembly Resolution 623 (vii) to consider Commodity Trade and Economic Development gave careful thought to the possibility of introducing automatic financial compensation schemes to correct extraordinary fluctuations in terms of trade. They considered that there were merits, but also difficulties and shortcomings in such a scheme and recommended finally, and I quote—"However, should nations prove unable to agree on their arrangements for moderating either the excessive fluctuations of prices and incomes or the ill consequences of these fluctuations, then they might do well to take a second look at automatic compensatory schemes." Mr. Chairman, my delegation is convinced that the ill consequences of the fluctuations have reached a degree which calls for the immediate consideration of the compensatory scheme.

We find that this specific aspect of the problem has also been brought up in the discussions of the 7th Session of the Commission on International Commodity Trade. The report of the Session states and I quote—"The Commission agreed to consider at its 8th Session international measures designed to compensate for fluctuations in foreign exchange receipts from the export of primary commodities. In this connection, the Commission recommends that the International Monetary Fund be invited to inform the Commission about its policies and procedures as they bear on the subject under consideration."

My delegation is of the view that the consideration of a compensatory fund of the nature proposed calls for urgent examination by a committee of experts in consultation with the countries producing primary commodities and those which are the principal importers of such commodities. Further, the association of the International Monetary Fund and the Food and Agriculture Organization with the examination of this problem would, we feel, be invaluable and should be secured. The Committee should be required to submit its report in time for discussion at the next session of the General Assembly.

In conclusion, Mr. Chairman, may I say how fully my delegation subscribes to the views expressed by our distinguished Secretary-General in the statement he made on July 6, 1959, before the Economic and Social Council on the problem of commodity instability. I quote: "while I recognize the acute difficulties in this field, I cannot help wondering whether we have really exhausted all our intellectual and moral resources in trying to find a more broadly based solution to the problem than has thus far emerged. It is, perhaps, at least worth considering whether a new approach might be made towards some such solution ...... For the longer run ahead, are we sure that there is a sufficient awareness of the problems and frustrations which

are building up progressively in the under-developed countries as their peoples grow more and more conscious of the fact that time is slipping away from them? Can we rest content with the fact that all the efforts of recent years—and I do not under-estimate them—have still not sufficed to prevent the gap between rich and poor countries from continuing to increase. There is a widespread feeling in the under-developed countries of the need for some new breakthrough on the road to economic development".

I submit that the proposal formulated by my delegation is in line with this thinking and I commend it for your acceptance.

Address to the Fifteenth Session of the United Nations General Assembly on September 29, 1960

Mr. President,

Your election to preside over this historic session bears eloquent testimony to your eminence among the representatives to the United Nations. It is a recognition of your personal merits and acknowledged experience in the affairs of the organization.

Sir, to use the language of hyperbole, may I say, in the words of a Persian poet, that stars looking from the firmament into this Assembly might feel a little envious of the scintillating galaxy gathered here. The great men, who have come from the East and the West, personify the might and the majesty of the countries they represent. They are here today with a single purpose; to find a solution to the problems of this troubled world; and while they are here, mankind waits in breathless suspense. Some of them are armed with the awesome power of life and death over the human race, but we believe that they have come to the United Nations in quest of peace. They have come to parley, to try to lay down their arms, to find means of living together in peace with one another in a world free from fear and free from want.

This year and this session will remain famous in history because of the presence of many African nations, who have won freedom and have been admitted to the United Nations. That great continent which was called dark but on which the light of freedom now shines, is free to bring its youth and its vigour to the service of its peoples. For many generations, the Africans were held in bondage. Today they are free, and are here with us as equals to discuss and resolve the problems facing humanity.

May I mention here that I have been instructed by President Mohammad Ayub Khan to extend to our African comrades his warm personal greetings.

Now that the chains of political subjection, theirs and ours, have been broken, we look forward sincerely to close relations with the African states. Despite the long distances between us, there are historical ties of faith and culture between the teeming peoples of Africa and Pakistan. These bonds transcend distances and differences of custom and language.

Sir, we have gathered here from all parts of the world—all seeking one paramount objective—PEACE. We had hoped that the great nations of the world, who have conquered space, would teach us here to conquer our passions and our vanities so that we may live in peace without fear. Though but a few days have passed since we came full of hope, we already witness disillusionment. We had thought that it was a manifestation of the new strength of the United Nations that great nations, who among themselves commanded the strength to destroy, had come here to ensure peace. But to our dismay, we find that this great house of peace, to which are committed the aspirations of all nations, has itself become a target of attack. This can only bring disappointment to us all, who look to the United Nations as the instrument which man has forged to control his ambitions and his anger.

The course of world affairs over the last decade has demonstrated the fact that while at critical times the great powers dispense with the United Nations in both aggravating and easing their tensions, it is the smaller countries, the defenceless ones, that stand in dire need of this organization in order to shield themselves from the dangers of power politics and in moderating the policies of the great powers.

Mr. President, it has been said of great historical figures that they wade across the world to make an epoch, bless, confuse or appal.

What kind of epoch are we about to make? Have we come here to bless or to appal?

The peoples of the world live under a perpetual terror of annihilation. In a matter of minutes, cities can be destroyed and the countryside laid waste by means which neither the imagination nor the cruelty of Attila or of Genghiz Khan could have conceived. We do not believe that any of the nuclear powers at present would deliberately launch a war of extermination. But the possibilities of miscalculation, mistake or accident, which may unleash such a calamity, cannot be precluded. For 15 years the great powers have talked of disarmament, but with what result? Not a single division has been disbanded nor a single tank destroyed by agreement. There has been some reduction of armed forces and presumably of some armaments. But these reductions have taken place by unilateral action, not by agreement. There is, therefore, nothing to prevent their unilateral increase.

In securing the peace of the world through disarmament, undoubtedly the end is more important than the means. Barely 12 months ago, we discussed disarmament in this assembly in an atmosphere radiating with hope.

But, unfortunately, the summit conference which followed it failed and the storms which gathered there overtook the Ten-Nation Committee.

Despite a measure of rapprochement between the two sides in the negotiations in the Ten-Nation Committee, the objective of general and complete disarmament remains distant so long as fundamental differences between them are not resolved. Two of the main difficulties relate to inspection measures. The first pertains to control—not control over what is to be reduced, on which agreement in principle has been reached—but over the verification of armed forces and armaments either before or after reduction in each stage. The second relates to the technical difficulties of ensuring by inspection that no undeclared stocks of nuclear weapons are concealed. It is admitted on both sides that such hidden stockpiles cannot be discovered by any means now known to either side. We note the Soviet contention that with the implementation of general and complete disarmament, the difficulties of control, including verification of undeclared stockpiles will disappear because all means of delivering them to their targets will have been eliminated. We need a fuller and a more convincing explanation of this thesis before it can be accepted as an adequate answer to the formidable difficulties which have supervened in the way of the total elimination of nuclear weapons under effective international control.

The Pakistan delegation welcomes the pledge of the Chairman of the Council of Ministers of the U.S.S.R., in his statement last Friday, to resume negotiations with the Western Powers who have been waiting for this positive response since last June. We note that the document circulated by the Soviet delegation entitled "Basic Provisions of a Treaty on General and Complete Disarmament" revises in one important respect the Soviet plan of June 2. It is now proposed that the armed forces and conventional armaments, of the United States and of the Soviet Union, should be reduced in the first stage to a figure of 1.7 million and of the other states to fixed levels. Conventional armaments thus released are to be destroyed and military expenditures of states to be correspondingly reduced.

It is the view of my delegation that if obstacles to general and complete disarmament cannot be eliminated immediately, there is no reason why some partial disarmament measures should not be undertaken now. A specific task of the General Assembly at this session should be to bring about an agreement in principle between the East and the West on the reduction in the levels of the armed forces of the United States and the Soviet Union to a figure between 2.5 and 1.7 million as well as the reduction of conventional armaments to related levels and the elimination of stocks thus released. This agreement in principle should be followed by negotiations to fix the levels of forces and armaments of the other great powers. If this should come to pass, the prospect of a real measure of immediate world-wide

disarmament under international control will unfold itself.

In addition to a real measure of conventional disarmament, the respective proposals of the Western and the Eastern powers encourage us to believe that other initial measures are also possible in the immediate future.

It cannot be expected that all these intricate questions of substance can be resolved by the General Assembly. That is why a negotiating committee was established by the Foreign Ministers of the four great powers in September 1959. Many distinguished representatives have referred to the constitution of this committee. At present it has 5 members each, from the Western and Eastern powers. It has been suggested that the committee be expanded to include other interests as well. We agree to all this, but in our view, what is more important is the immediate resumption of negotiations.

May I, at this stage, Mr. President, touch upon a related question. It is a matter of regret that despite two years of negotiations, no agreement has been reached to halt test explosions of nuclear and thermo nuclear weapons. We would appeal to the parties concerned, with all the emphasis at our command, that they reach immediate agreement to stop such tests in order that the present uncertain voluntary moratorium is replaced by a mandatory prohibition under effective international control.

In a search for general and complete disarmament, it is not possible to ignore a study of the United Nations Organization with a view to determining how its machinery can best be developed in support of disarmament. If general and complete disarmament is achieved, the special responsibility of the permanent members of the Security Council for the maintenance of international peace and security, as reflected in Article 27, Paragraph 3 of the Charter pertaining to the right of veto, will have withered away. The principle of sovereign equality of all states, large and small, will then be feeed from the anomaly and contradiction imposed by the power of veto.

We have always been in favour of restricting the use of the right of veto as far as possible, as it is against the spirit of the Charter. We are, therefore, constrained to express our regret that at a time when its elimination is being foreseen, suggestions should be made to extend its scope to the administrative agency of the United Nations.

The Charter of the United Nations supplements the rules of general international law. By outlawing war, the use or threat of force, and enjoining the settlement of disputes by peaceful means in accordance with the principles of justice and international law, the Charter establishes its supremacy. The International Law Commission, in the report of its second session, enunciated the proposition that in the light of the rules of general international law read together with the provisions of the Charter, the sovereignty of a state is subject to the supremacy of international law. In their actual international conduct, however, many member states of this organization have shown

themselves unwilling to strengthen the rule of law by failing to accept the compulsory jurisdiction of the International Court of Justice.

Pakistan, this year, has submitted a revised declaration accepting the compulsory jurisdiction of the International Court to include all cases, other than those which under international law fall essentially within the domestic jurisdiction of a state. It has thereby surrendered its sovereign right to determine for itself whether or not a particular matter is essentially within its domestic jurisdiction and has solemnly declared in advance that, should such a question arise, it would be content to accept a determination made in accordance with the rules of international law. Pakistan has thus demonstrated in tangible terms its willingness to subordinate its sovereignty to the supremacy of international law.

Under conditions of general and complete disarmament, the supremacy of international law must be proclaimed an imperative of international conduct. Looking towards this evolution in international life, the time has come to pursue with a greater sense of urgency, the task of codification of international law and its progressive development, envisaged in Article 13, Paragraph 1(*a*) of the Charter. Thought must also be given to the need to amend the statute of the International Court of Justice to extend the scope of its jurisdiction to all matters to be provided for in a treaty on general and complete disarmament and to make Article 36 relating to the declaration on compulsory jurisdiction, applicable to all legal disputes arising from the treaty for the duration of its validity.

The economic development of under-developed countries poses a challenge of the highest magnitude to all the nations of the world. Both, President Eisenhower and Prime Minister Khrushchev, expressed great solicitude for the welfare and economic progress of these countries. And we, the people of the under-developed countries, note this with profound satisfaction.

The Chairman of the Council of Ministers of the U.S.S.R. referred to the economic development of the Central Asian Republics. We are conscious of the great development which, in the course of the last 40 years, has placed the U.S.S.R. in the forefront of scientific and technological progress. The countries of Asia, too, have tirelessly endeavoured within their limited resources to improve the conditions of their peoples.

Despite our meagre resources, the pace of our development has been significant and this represents, by and large, the voluntary sacrifices of our people. The Chairman of the Council of Ministers of the Soviet Union cited a few statistics relating to some under-developed countries, including my own, to highlight the contrast in the economic progress between the Central Asian Republics and their neighbouring countries. For example, he mentioned the low rate of electric generation per capita as an illustration of our primitive economy. It is true that the position is as suggested by the statistics.

The only point that I may mention is that the present generation of power in Pakistan is more than 700% of what it was when we became independent a few years ago. In the same context, I would like to repeat that despite our limitations, and our meagre resources, we have achieved substantial progress.

Since independence, our industrial production has risen by approximately 400% and during the last two years by about 70%. But, by far the most, significant change brought about in the wake of the revolution in October, 1958, has been the radical land reforms, which have not only brought about social justice and the promise of better future for the tillers of the soil who constitute 85% of our population, but have also changed the pattern of our society. They have given a sense of self-respect and dignity to our masses who before this revolutionary change were crushed under the burden of an iniquitous and effete social system. These are great changes and our people see before them the dawn of a better life. Their energies have been mobilized for the good of the common weal.

My country has received generous aid from the United States of America. We have made good use of this assistance and there is in evidence a considerable degree of improvement in the infra-structure of our economy on which to base our future development. We acknowledge with gratitude this assistance; but at the same time, we have been a victim, like many other under-developed countries, of the harsh and unrelenting interplay of international market forces. During the last many years, the terms of trade have moved progressively against the primary producing countries. In fact, the position is that we have lost much more in trade than we have gained by aid. There is no co-ordination of policies amongst the primary producers, and they suffer from their disjointed state. On the other hand, much of Europe, for instance, is becoming increasingly a closed community, which gives it great economic and commercial advantage. The future is grim indeed for the under-developed countries, for their dependence on foreign aid is likely to increase rather than diminish in the immediate future. This deterioration, in the economic conditions of African, Asian and Latin-American countries, which depend so heavily and so exclusively on the export of a few primary commodities, is a subject which should become of paramount importance to the Secretariat.

During the 15 years of the existence of the United Nations, the economic and social picture of the world has become increasingly a study in contrast. The appalling poverty and misery of some parts of the world stand out in sharp outline against the abundance and opulence of other parts of this same world. An average annual income in the under-developed countries of approximately $120 per person is to be contrasted with an average income in the more advanced countries of $800 per capita. According to another

estimate, the majority of the inhabitants of the under-developed countries subsists on an income of only $8 per month as against $9 per day in the most highly developed countries.

There are two aspects of this difference in the standards of living which are of crucial importance to the world today. Firstly, that the disparity is not only great but growing; and secondly, that the peoples of the under-developed countries, living so long at levels of bare survival, are no longer prepared to accept such conditions of life as immutable. A revolution of rising expectations is sweeping through these countries. Fatalism and resignation have given way to expectation and demand.

The under-developed countries are in a predicament. Despite all the sacrifices and austerity of which their peoples are capable, the march forward is only nominal because of the simultaneous slide-back of trade. It was hoped that their political emancipation would lead to economic development. But, unfortunately, so far the odds have been heavily against them. I have already mentioned the change in the terms of trade against the under-developed countries which means in effect that the improvement in the standards of living of the manufacturing countries has in a large measure taken place at the cost of starving people of the backward nations. Would it not be an act of historic justice if some restitution were made in the present for the wealth which flowed in the past from these countries to enrich the economies of those which are now so industrially advanced?

Mr. President, I have gone into some detail about economic matters only because they pose serious problems for a large part of humanity.

To sum up briefly our position is: because of the declining terms of trade all that we are able to do despite our best efforts and sacrifices is to reduce the pace of retrogression. Unless this decline is halted, significant progress will not be possible and the primary producing countries will always have to depend on foreign assistance even to maintain their present level of living.

Turning to political problems, may I say, Mr. President, that the situation in the Congo continues to cause concern to all of us. The threat of unilateral intervention by the great powers in the heart of Africa and the consequent danger to peace in the African continent has not been removed. If Africa is to be saved from becoming an arena of conflict between the East and the West, it is imperative for the United Nations to play a positive and impartial role. We believe that as far as possible the Secretary General has endeavoured to scrupulously comply with the spirit and the letter of the resolutions of the Security Council. However, considering the magnitude and the complexity of the task and the speed with which the United Nations operation had to be launched, Mr. Hammerskjold and his associates must be considered to have faithfully carried out their difficult mandate in accordance with the basic principles endorsed by the Security Council. The Pakistan

delegation recognizes that the Secretary-General's mission is an extremely delicate one and has not been made any easier by the internal confusion in the Republic of the Congo. Therefore, we take this opportunity reaffirming our confidence in the Secretary-General's integrity. It would appear to my delegation that at present the main problem in the Congo is the prevalence of internal strife which is unhappily preventing the restoration of normal conditions. The resolution adopted at the emergency session does envisage the appointment of an Advisory Committee on the Congo in consultation with the Secretary-General, consisting of Asian-African representatives for the purpose of conciliation between the parties to the political and constitutional conflicts. In the furtherance of this objective, the African states must of necessity play a leading role. Thus the mandate given to the Secretary-General can well be supplemented by the good offices of the African states in the solution of the internal problems of the Republic of the Congo. Whatever might have been the changes in the situation and the conflicts of interest, it was the general expectation that United Nations operation would crystallize the positive role that the organization could play in strengthening the independence of emerging nations against external pressures.

Mr. President, my delegation believes that the isolation of the African continent from the East-West conflict must be ensured by the Africans themselves and supplemented by the assistance of the United Nations whenever necessary. It cannot be done by the United Nations alone because the organization itself is often a centre of this conflict. It may not always be capable of adequately filling a vacuum. Therefore, the principal actors on the African scene must be the Africans themselves, and in our opinion they are capable of answering their own destiny. That great continent is pulsating with a new life and a new force. It is in transition from the old to the new. Colonial empires are being succeeded by community of sovereign states, conscious of their solidarity and determined to give Africa its rightful place in the comity of nations. We have heard in this hall the voices of free Africa and seen the passion in African hearts for peace and justice and their determination to exclude outside interference in the affairs of their continent.

Mr. President, it is a matter of sorrow that great nations and statesmen should not see the logical sequence of events as they must ensue. Events carry with them the seeds of consequences and like nemesis, they are inexorable. Prejudice and chauvinism make men myopic. In this world of turmoil and conflict, the heart of humanity is yet with the peoples struggling for freedom and equality. One may delay the deliverance of a people but then, nature extorts a high price for it, as in the Congo. It may also do so in the Union of South Africa where racial discrimination is rampant. As one who

is aware of liberal political thought, I am appalled that in a country which claims to be civilized and Christian, human beings should be denied basic human rights because of their race and colour.

The Sharpville disturbances underline the serious nature of the situation prevailing in the Union of South Africa. They made it very plain that unless the situation improves, conditions would deteriorate to an explosive point. The General Assembly has adopted resolutions for many years asking the Union Government to cease and desist from its discriminatory racial policy. The South African government has so far ignored the appeal to reason. In a continent which is now free and in the midst of peoples determined to make good their claim to equality, South Africa cannot remain isolated. To attempt to do so is to oppose the march of history. The future generations of South Africa may have to pay a very heavy price for the resentment and rancour that the apartheid policy of that country is creating around her.

Mr. President, nothing in this world is quite perfect and it would be futile to expect perfection in an organization which combines the attributes and characteristics of almost all the nations of the world. Looking at the performance of the United Nations from the darker side, one would be inclined to stress the failures, the unsettled problems, the unattained objectives, the hopes unfulfilled, the promises unrealized. There are a *catena* of them, but life must be measured not only by failures but also by accomplishments. We can mention grave failures where peoples have been denied their rights because political expediency has prevailed over the conscience of nations. I shall not dilate on them, for, despite their tragic remembrance, we still have faith that right must prevail and the United Nations must succeed. In this context, amongst the other vital unresolved issues, I have Algeria in mind—that strife-torn land where the blood of patriots still flows in their fight for freedom. Is it not an irony of fate that that struggle should have to be won against a nation which through history has been identified with liberty and equality?

At the opening of the General Assembly last year, we welcomed the declaration of President de Gaulle recognizing the right of self-determination for the people of Algeria. We regret that no significant development has since taken place which would translate that inalienable right into a reality. At one time there appeared a prospect of a rapprochement between Algeria and France, but the preliminary talks to arrange the pourparlers have failed. Let me declare here that the sympathies of the people of Pakistan are with the valiant sons of Algeria, fighting heroically for their freedom. At a time when so many countries on the continent of Africa are taking their place in this Assembly, it is with great sorrow that we note the absence of Algeria. We appeal for a new effort on the part of the parties concerned to settle this human problem by peaceful means. If we succeed, a tragic chapter will

close in history, and to the brave people of Algeria will be brought peace and the freedom and dignity for which they have fought so long and so well.

Another problem which haunts the conscience of nations is the negation of justice to that part of the Arab nation which comprises the population of Palestine. The failure to solve the Palestine question has kept the Middle East for all these years on the verge of conflagration. It has been suggested that the tension in the Middle East should be removed by the dictates of realism. In the view of my delegation the only realistic approach in this case is to recognize the human rights of a million Arab refugees who have been uprooted from their homes. Unless the resolutions of the General Assembly on this question are implemented, no arrangements to enforce peace in the Middle East by outside powers are likely to be effective or lasting.

The solution of the problems to which I have referred is, without doubt, difficult and seemingly insurmountable. But they have to be solved and solved by peaceful means. The principle of the peaceful settlement of international dispute is a cardinal feature of the foreign policy of Pakistan. Only a few days ago, ur firm faith in peaceful procedures was vindicated when we resolved our dispute with India over the distribution of the waters of the Indus Basin. This dispute, which had defied solution for almost as many years as the existence of Pakistan, has ended by the signing of the Indus Waters Treaty. The conclusion of this Treaty demonstrates the triumph of the procedures of peaceful settlement. We are hopeful, Mr. President, that this initiative for peace will be extended now to the only grave issue still outstanding between India and Pakistan, namely the Kashmir Question. It is our most earnest hope that this noble precedent will give rise to a new spirit in the relations between Pakistan and India, and lead to a settlement of this problem of problems of our vast region.

Mr. President, we have always believed that every people and every nation must be permitted to live according to its own way of life, which reflects its accumulated national heritage. In fact it represents an accretion of history. We, the 90 million people of Pakistan, claim to pattern our lives on the precepts of Islam. After all our turmoils and tribulations we now have a leader in whom the people of our country have reposed their hopes and their faith. He firmly believes in promoting fraternal relations between the peoples of Asia and Africa, and to that end he has directed his efforts in a most positive and constructive way. Under his inspiring leadership, Pakistan is engaged in a great political experiment known as "Basic Democracies". The objective of this political system is to foster and encourage the creative urges of our people.

The system of Basic Democracies is an attempt to evolve a political framework related to the conditions in the country, in conformity with our requirements and suited to the genius of our people. The system enables the people

of Pakistan to be associated in the activities of government through their elected representatives at every level of the administration beginning from the village and culminating at the centre of the highest functions of the state. Our objective in Pakistan is not to imitate systems of policy which have evolved in the altogether different historical circumstances of other countries. Our aim is to institute a system which would be rooted in the experience of our own people and would enable them to reorient their whole outlook regarding their collective welfare. We believe that our system of Basic Democracies is the answer to our needs and perhaps a guideline for other peoples placed in situations similar to us.

Mr. President, it has been said that hope builds sooner than knowledge destroys, and thus, despite the many buffets of fortune and the fluctuations in international relations, mankind has subsisted on hope, hope for a world free from humiliating poverty and degrading fear. The progress of science has opened majestic vistas of new worlds. That, while there is the infinity of space to be explored and conquered, those in whose hands lies the knowledge and the means to do so, are engaged in internecine struggle, creates new fears every day. The problem of poverty remains unsolved. There are hundreds of millions of men from birth to the grave who live an existence of privation and insecurity. May we not hope that these problems may be dealt with as the primary ones and that the phantom of armed conflicts and nuclear annihilation will be exorcized from the world—so beautiful and full of such great opportunities of happiness.

The Charter enjoins us not only to save ourselves but also succeeding generations from the carnage of war. It has often been said that in the event of a world conflagration, there will be neither victor nor vanquished. This seems obvious but even if there be a sham victor, his victory will be that of dying over the dead, his thrill, the dubious one of a glory in the utter demolition of civilization, the destruction of its culture, of its universities, of its institutions for art and science, of its mosques and temples and churches. It will be in this scene that the victor too shall pass into nothingness.

We have the opportunity, and the means to avert this catastrophe and to realize mankind's dream of progress towards a future unbelievable at the present time. Shall we also have the will and the courage? We have the means because we are now told that according to correct interpretation of Marxism-Leninism war between the two social systems is not inevitable. But those who witness the arms race between the East and the West cannot but be burdened by the fear that unless it is immediately halted and the trend reversed, war is inevitable. A race in armaments has never ushered peace. It has ever brought the sword. To one who can contemplate the terrestrial scene, with deep insight into the march of history,

it would seem that a blind fate is moving us towards self-destruction. Is it that an imminent and blind will rules our affairs, driving us to inevitable doom? May it be given to the great men who take part in this Assembly, to prove that it is otherwise, that mankind does have a freedom of choice and that peace and war in this age of glorious opportunity and mortal peril are not predetermined but hinge upon the exercise of man's free will and his determination to avert the ultimate tragedy.

Address to the Second Committee of the Fifteenth Session of the United Nations General Assembly on October 14, 1960

Mr. Chairman,

May I first of all offer to you the congratulations of my delegation on your election as the Chairman of this Committee. We are confident that under your wise guidance this Committee will be able to maintain, if not enhance, its past record of constructive achievement. We also extend our good wishes to Mr. Rao and to Mr. Ahmad on their election as Vice-Chairman and Rapporteur.

My delegation has listened with great interest to the statement made before this Committee by the Under-Secretary for Economic and Social Affairs. Mr. de Seynes has drawn attention to the most striking feature of the current world economic situation, the wide and continuing discrepancy in the rate and trend of economic development between the industrialised and the under-developed countries. The value of the net national product at factor cost of 16 developed countries stands, as of this year, nearly 300% higher than the share of about 60 other countries and territories. This situation is reflected in the wide, and what is more tragic, a growing difference in the standards of living of the peoples inhabiting different parts of the same world. The 100 under-developed countries and territories, comprising about 2/3rds of the total population of the globe, have an average annual per capita income of approximately $120. The average is less than $70 in my own country, as in several others. What these figures signify in terms of human needs can be realised only if we place them in the perspective of the average per capita income of the more fortunate countries—more than $2,000 in the United States, $875 in Britain and the Scandinavian countries, and $550 in the USSR.

These differences, Mr. Chairman, tell a story of human misery which the

world of today can no longer afford to ignore. Modern communications have reduced distance to proximity: lands which were once distant have become virtual neighbours. No country can now live in isolation or insulate itself against the tensions and forces that originate in the rest of the world.

The fact that the world has become one, not only in terms of distance, but also in the dissemination of ideas, has had several consequences. For one thing, the peoples of the under-developed countries no longer accept poverty as a part of inexorable destiny. On one hand they have reached the very edges of starvation; on the other they are today exposed to the ideas and aspirations of peoples who live in the more developed countries. New vistas have opened up before them giving shape to their suppressed longings. The age of despair imposed on them for so long by colonial rule and domination has given way to an age of expectation and demand. This phenomenon presents a unique opportunity and a great danger. It could be harnessed to the accomplishment of the great constructive tasks that face less developed countries. On the other hand, if the economic gulf between the advanced and the under-developed countries keeps steadily widening as at present, the resultant frustrations could only heighten world tensions. We are living in times when conflict, ideologies,—economic no less than political—are competing for the allegiance of man. It is a matter of concern to us that the challenge implicit in this situation, so pregnant with peril, has not as yet received that wide understanding and acceptance which is its due.

The growing oneness of the world has also made it abundantly clear that there is no fundamental conflict or dichotomy between the economic development of the under-developed countries and the prosperity and well being of the industrialized countries. One is essentially a function of the other. The context of economic growth provides the most effective and consistent framework for the harmonization of economic policies. The development of the backward areas of the world would undoubtedly raise the levels of living everywhere, increase demand, develop trade, and in general help the international economy to reach a higher level. The so-called structural changes in industry, of which we have heard so much recently, have already been completed in most of the Western countries. In fact, the imports of the under-developed countries have consistently exceeded their exports since the end of the Korean War, and they have almost all been forced to draw heavily on their external reserves. These reserves were at best but small and, if a balance at a higher level is to be achieved, the resources and, therefore, the productive capacity of the under-developed countries must be raised in proportion.

The Ministerial level meetings of the Economic and Social Council held last summer in Geneva have served to emphasize the economic interdepend-

ence of the world. What is essential, in the opinion of my delegation, is the promotion of a sense of international responsibility for raising the levels of living in under-developed countries, and the adoption of a global approach to the problems of economic growth and dynamics. Without the development of such responsibility, the substance of the problem of economic development must continue to elude us.

The central problem of economic development is the provision of adequate investment capital to the under-developed countries. There is a feeling in the advanced countries that the less developed countries do not make sufficient effort to mobilize their own idle resources by internal measures. In the industrialized countries the process of capital formation is almost automatic as a result of adequate savings, but in the almost stagnant economies of the under-developed countries, the margin between income and consumption is so low as to make the capacity for savings practically non-existent. In Pakistan, in spite of compulsory savings measures, popularization of savings institutions, expansion of banking facilities, and the provision of varied incentives in the tax structure for investment from profits, the rate of savings which we have been able to generate has fallen far short of development needs. In order to prevent the slowing down of development programmes, Pakistan has also attempted to encourage the import of capital goods at the cost of restricting drastically imports of consumer goods and other necessities of life. These steps have been taken because we are fully aware of the need for self-help in economic development. It must be realized, however, that if economic development on the desired level and with the desired speed is to be financed entirely from domestic resources, the economic and political structure of an under-developed country is exposed to stresses and strains which might make orderly progress of any kind impossible.

A substantial contribution of foreign capital is needed to create conditions which would enable the under-developed countries to break through the "vicious circle of poverty" and sustain a sufficient pace of development to reach the "take off" stage. My delegation is happy to note that in the last few years a certain degree of progress has been achieved in this direction, bath as regards the availability of funds and the improvement of institutional machinery for international action. The United Nations Special Fund has been described as "a strategic bre k-through of incomparable significance" for economic development. It has an important role to play in the building of infra-structure and in increasing the capacity for absorption of capital in the under-developed countries. Equally gratifying has been the recent establishment of the International Development Association. A considerable sum of money has thereby been added to the stream of funds available for developmental purposes. If the Association comes to enjoy, as we hope it

will, a certain degree of flexibility, which would allow it to take into account the specific situations of different countries in negotiating terms of loans, it would undoubtedly give a new life to the international credit system.

The International Bank for Reconstruction and Development and the International Finance Corporation have continued to afford the under-developed countries invaluable assistance in finding loan capital for their development. Since 1957-58 such loans have averaged a figure of about $700 million annually as compared to an annual rate of $400 million in earlier years. The loans have been utilized to finance the development of mineral resources, improvements in transportation systems, and general economic, including agricultural, development. Over the years the bank has come to occupy a position of great prestige in the international financial community which enables it to perform many subsidiary functions of great value to the developing countries. I would like to take this opportunity, Mr. Chairman, to express here our deep appreciation of the role played by the International Bank in the settlement of the Indus Water question. The signing of the Indo-Pakistan Canal Water Treaty last month in Karachi is an event of historic importance for which the World Bank deserves much credit. The Treaty is likely to have a profound effect on the economic development of the entire sub-continent. We appreciate also the plan evolved by the bank for financing the massive expenditures involved, and are grateful to the friendly governments which have so generously committed their resources and, thereby, contributed towards the final settlement.

While emphasizing the importance of international assistance in the matter of financing and providing other assistance to the developing countries, we do not wish to minimize, or in any way under-rate, the valuable contribution which bilateral assistance and regional arrangements, such as the Colombo Plan, have rendered. In the case of Pakistan, for instance, the contribution made by the Colombo Plan in initiating and sustaining development in such basic fields as agriculture, health and social welfare services, labour and public administration, can hardly be over-emphasized. Similarly, of the total of approximately $1½ billion that Pakistan has received in foreign assistance during the past decade, no less than one billion dollars has come through bilateral assistance from the United States.

The situation in respect of the flow of international private investment to the under-developed countries has also improved to a certain extent. Both capital-exporting and recipient countries have adopted a number of measures designed to increase the total flow of funds to the low-income economies. My own country, for example, has provided several new incentives and facilities for foreign investors, such as, repatriation of profits without restriction, liberal tax holidays, compensation guarantees, relief from double taxation, special concessions to specified industries and so on. An Invest-

ment Promotion Bureau has been established to provide the fullest possible information and assistance to foreign investors. The Bureau is charged with receiving all applications for the establishment of new industrial concerns involving foreign investment, disseminating information regarding investment opportunities in Pakistan, and assisting foreign and local investors in obtaining import licences, land, building materials, power, water, railway sidings, technical help and any other facility for which the co-operation of the central or provincial governments or statutory bodies is necessary.

The fact, however, remains, Mr. Chairman, that the total of funds available to the under-developed countries at present, estimated to be about $4 billion per year, is pitifully inadequate to their needs. We have, as I have noted earlier, about 100 countries and territories with an average per capita income of $120 per year. The total of capital available to them through domestic savings and international investments makes possible an annual rate of increase in their national incomes of about 3%. Correcting this figure against the average rate of population growth, we are left with an annual net increase in national income of only 1%. This means in the case of Pakistan, for example, a net increase in personal living standards of about 70 cents per person. This is far too low and unacceptable.

In view of this situation, it is a matter of regret to my delegation that the response of member countries, particularly the developed countries, to General Assembly resolution 1424 (XIV), sponsored by 47 nations and adopted by 67 votes to none with 15 abstentions last year, has not been very encouraging. The resolution called upon member states to reappraise their position as regards extending material support for the early establishment of a United Nations Capital Development Fund. In our opinion, Mr. Chairman, the eventual establishment of such an organization first conceived of as UNEDA, then as SUNFED, and now finally as a U.N. Capital Development Fund, is imperative, and in the long run, inevitable. It has been argued that with the recent inauguration of the International Development Association, the efforts towards the establishment of a multilateral agency have come to their final fruition, and alternatively, that since the totality of funds available for international public investment is in any case necessarily limited, it is unrealistic to plan for an additional financing machinery at the present, when the resources of most potential contributors are fully committed to the financing of the I.D.A. We do not agree with this point of view. The recent up-swing in world economic activity has undoubtedly brought forward new capital resources, as shown by the fact that they have been found for bilateral and multilateral action outside the United Nations. In this situation, we believe that the I.D.A. and a SUNFED-type fund could very profitably "coexist" and supplement each other. Although the I.D.A. would undoubtedly increase the total of funds

available to the under-developed countries, it would only partly meet their total requirements not only in quantity, but also as to the type of financing required. Moreover, a truly multilateral United Nations agency, such as the proposed fund, has the basic advantage that it enables those nations to make a contribution to international economic co-operation which, for reasons of policy or scruple, do not find themselves able at the moment to participate in the International Development Association.

In this connection, Mr. Chairman, I would venture to make a suggestion. As you are aware, in the last few years a number of under-developed countries have produced Five Year and other long term plans for their economic development. Pakistan has inaugurated its Second Five Year Plan in the course of this year; India will be launching its third. Several more are likely to follow. The plans are, in effect, the formulation of long term policies for economic growth. Such formulations are necessary in order to achieve the maximum, if not the optimum, utilization of limited resources. Nor are such programmes for economic growth, provided they are sufficiently pragmatic and flexible, incompatible with conditions permitting full scope to private initiative.

The emergence of such long-term projections have made a broadening of institutional arrangements for international co-operation necessary. The need is on two levels: financing of the programmes and their co-ordination.

A common characteristic of most of the plans for economic development is their urgent need for financial assistance. Pakistan's Second Five Year Plan envisages a total expenditure of U.S. $3,990 million. The plan is proposed to be financed to the extent of U.S. $2,310 million from internal resources and U.S. $1,680 million from foreign assistance. The successful implementation of the plan depends essentially upon the inflow of foreign capital in the shape of multilateral and bilateral assistance and private foreign capital.

The available institutional machinery for international co-operation is not geared to meet either the amount or the nature of these requirements. The loans of the International Bank, for instance, have in the past, with some exceptions, been for the financing of specific projects, and the maturities, of these loans have been largely determined by the type of project rather than by the overall conditions of the economy. What is needed are loans for the support of development programmes as a whole, or for certain parts of the programme, and an extension of the period of repayment of the loans. The policy of linking loans to specific projects is inadequate in other respects also. It often leads to unintended distortions in favour of basic utilities and large schemes to the neglect of activities which have a more immediate impact on production; agricultural development schemes and social service projects usually remain under-financed.

Co-ordination of the new development plans is likely to be as important task as their financing. There is an immediate need for expert advice, collection and collation of data, development of techniques for medium and long term plans, and above all, for harmonization of policies. What is needed is the establishment of a consultative machinery for the co-ordination of development plans on a regional basis. It is necessary for a new international body to perform in respect of development plans the functions which the U.N. special fund performs in respect of individual projects.

It is the view of my delegation, Mr. Chairman, that a United Nations Capital Development Fund, conceived in terms of the new plans for development, could fulfil both the needs which we have described, namely, the need for financing and the need for co-ordination. The rapidly deteriorating economic situation of the under-developed countries makes the early establishment of such a body a matter of high priority. It would be regrettable, indeed, if the question of financing of economic development is placed on the agenda of the General Assembly, from year to year, merely as a salve to the United Nations' conscience. The time has come to break new ground and mark a departure from the established patterns of thinking. I would remind the distinguished representatives present here that these development plans embody almost the last hope and chance for the peoples of the under-developed countries, and the success or failure of these plans will be of decisive importance to all of us.

There is one other aspect of the situation, Mr. Chairman, to which I would like to draw attention. I refer to the fall in the price-index of primary commodities in recent years and the consequent change in the terms of trade against the under-developed countries. The fall in the price level of primary commodities has been such that the loss suffered by the under-developed countries is in some cases greater than the total of international aid and assistance received by them so far. Even the present up-swing in world economic activity has failed to bring about a corresponding rise in commodity prices. While the quantum of commodity trade rose by 10% in 1959, the over-all commodity price level fell by 2% as compared to 1958 and by 8% as compared to 1957. In fact, the terms of trade of primary commodities in relation to manufactures has at the moment reached its lowest level since 1950. This has meant, in effect, a drastic reduction in the flow of capital resources available for programmes of economic development.

It is against this background of inadequate financial resources that the movement of commodity prices is to be viewed. In this context, it will be a tragic mistake, Mr. Chairman, to regard the price movements in the commodity market as simply exercises in the interplay of impersonal market forces. Price movements in the commodity market affect the most reliable and effective instrument of economic development, namely, the capacity of the

under-developed countries to contribute to their own development. No lasting success can be achieved in the field of economic growth unless and until, as a recent report of the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development has pointed out, the under-developed countries are enabled to mobilize their own resources. The capacity of the under-developed countries to contribute to their own development depends largely on their export earnings as the plant and machinery and the technical facilities required for the purpose of development have to be imported from industrialized countries. The under-developed countries have, under the present circumstances, to rely on the sale of their primary commodities for their export earnings.

The question is essentially one of the totality of funds available for economic development. Strains on the balance of payment of a primary producing country develop from two sources: strains which arise from the development programmes of the country, and strains which arise from the fall in its export earnings. As regards the first set of strains, it will be seen that there is a constructive element in them. Such strains in fact could be regarded as a measure of dynamic policy, and although it is possible, especially in theory, to rationalize or reduce them, a certain degree of pressure from them is inevitable. The second set of strains arising from the fall in export earnings is in the nature of an additional, unwelcome, and depressive burden. As things are at present, this additional burden is seriously affecting the development plans of the under-developed countries, and bringing to nought international co-operation, in all its manifold manifestations, directed to this end.

Apart from the continuing fall in prices, the commodity market has also been subject to excessive short term fluctuations. Such fluctuations have tended to disrupt economic planning, to discourage initiative and to threaten foreign exchange reserves. Developing countries are unable to foresee what their foreign exchange earnings are likely to be for a given period. A very slight shift in the economic forces operating in the industrialized countries is sufficient to reduce radically the purchasing power of the primary exporting countries and to bring to nothing any long term formulations which they might have made in respect of their economic and social growth.

In the long run the most fruitful approach to commodity problems would undoubtedly seem to lie in the creation of demand for primary commodities in the under-developed countries themselves. This process of transforming the exporters of primary commodities into their users, is, however, the very process of economic development, which is predicated on the maintenance of a steady level of export earnings. In the short run there are several lines of enquiry which could with advantage be pursued. It will be extremely interesting, for instance, to have an assessment of the possibility of using

compensatory financing measures to off-set fluctuations in the export income of primary producing countries. A group of experts is being appointed for this purpose in terms of General Assembly Resolution 1423 (XIV), which my delegation had the honour to sponsor last year. We await the report of the group of experts with considerable interest. Similarly, the implications and possibilities for an extension of commodity agreements and the economic consequences of the establishment of international buffer stocks need to be very carefully examined.

In conclusion, Mr. Chairman, I would like to say a few words on the subject of land reforms. Land reforms, which entail, in effect, the transformation of the agrarian structure of a country, is an essential facet of the process of economic development, and it is a pity that not enough attention has so far been paid to it in the consideration of international economic and social policies. We welcome the inclusion of this item in the agenda, and we hope that it will lead to a detailed and constructive discussion in this committee, which may find expression in the report of the Secretary-General called for in terms of General Assembly resolution 1426 (XIV).

The land reforms which have been recently introduced in Pakistan constitute a landmark in the field of agrarian legislation, and I think it will be appropriate if I present here a few of its salient features.

In January, 1959, President Mohammad Ayub Khan announced sweeping agrarian reforms for West Pakistan. The reforms were sorely needed. 0.1 per cent of the owners held amongst them 15 per cent of the land in properties of over 500 acres each, and at the other end of the scale were 65 per cent of the owners together holding just as much land in holdings of less than 5 acres each. A better distribution of land was obviously called for. On the other hand, many of the agricultural holdings were too small to be economic. The government, therefore, appointed a commission to examine the problem and make suitable recommendations. The commission, after very careful study, recommended that a ceiling and a floor should be fixed for agricultural holdings. The ceiling for the ownership of land was fixed at 500 acres for irrigated land and 1,000 acres for unirrigated land. These recommendations were accepted by the government and another commission has been appointed to implement them. This commission is at work and the land in excess of the ceiling fixed, which has been surrendered by the land owners, is being distributed to cultivating tenants, who are becoming land owners. Adequate compensation is being paid over an extended period for the land which has been taken over from the landlords. This compensation is financed out of the payments to be received from the new land owners over a period of time. As a result of this reform, 6 million acres of land are being distributed to cultivating tenants and nearly one and a half million tenants will become land owners.

In East Pakistan, legislation for land reform, designed to confer ownership rights on tenants and to eliminate intermediaries between the cultivators and the government was enacted as long ago as 1950. The legislation was, however, not effectively implemented. The present government has taken steps to ensure the implementation of this reform in East Pakistan and necessary funds are being provided for the payment of compensation to the previous land owners and other intermediaries. The reforms, which are being implemented with vigour, have already eliminated a state of feudalism which prevailed in certain parts of the country and have provided a greater equality of opportunity and an increased incentive for production. The social and economic benefits of these reforms to the country are expected to be enormous.

Address to the First Committee of the United Nations General Assembly on October 19, 1960

Mr. Chairman,

The survival of mankind is a race between disarmament and catastrophe. The race is heading towards a dangerous and accelerating crisis. We face the awesome possibility of a nuclear war. Should it break out, civilization will be in shambles. Ideologies and social systems will be swept away in common ruin.

For fifteen years world leaders have demonstrated a signal lack of political and moral courage to lead the world towards disarmament, to deliver it from the fear of war. They have placed their hopes for peace and security in nuclear stalemate supported by a continuing race in armaments. Yet, in the present state of technology, an arms race is the most unstable of all forms of security. It is evident to all of us that the present military balance is a precarious one. It is contingent on the capability of either side to keep abreast of the other in the deadly competition for weapons systems of ever increasing destructive power. There can be no assurance that one side may not gain a decisive, even though transitory, advantage by a break-through in technology. Should this occur, the equilibrium will be upset and the world threatened with the destruction of all the values and systems that man has been able to build for himself and posterity through the blood and toil of a hundred generations.

Many of us here, who represent the smaller nations of the world, take it that the heads of governments of the great armed powers, who have taken an active part in the present session of the General Assembly, came in search of a more permanent and secure basis for peace than that of the present temporary and precarious balance of terror. They have set forth their proposals for general and complete disarmament. It has now fallen to member

states of the United Nations, large and small, to give earnest consideration, as specifically requested by the Disarmament Commission in its resolution of August 19, 1960, to the substantive aspects of this question and to the results of the negotiations held in the Ten-Nation Disarmament Committee in Geneva this year. By doing so, we shall not only be exercising the right, but also discharging the direct responsibility, of the General Assembly under the Charter of the United Nations for achieving disarmament and fortifying the edifice of peace.

It is not the intention of my delegation to enter into a discussion of the technical details of the various plans and principles that are relevant to the present status of the disarmament problem. The Political Committee is not an appropriate body for the consideration of technical matters. We shall, therefore, confine our intervention to the political aspects of the problem. While doing so, we shall be guided by the thought that the issues involved are so fateful for the future of all nations that only an objective and non-partisan approach can do justice to the treatment of a subject of such importance as disarmament. At the same time, my delegation will not hesitate to express its views as to the merits of the stands taken by the East and by the West in the course of the Geneva negotiations.

The gravity of the situation that the General Assembly has been facing for the past few years and the urgency of finding a solution to the problem of disarmament have been emphasised with such frequency that they dominate our debates. Nevertheless, my delegation considers it necessary to remind once again that, while our efforts to find solutions to the problem have been making little progress, the problem itself has not stood still. The difficulties of control over new weapons of mass destruction and the means of their delivery are being compounded by the march of science and technology. When the negotiators meet again, their previous work becomes out of date for the rate of technological change is continually out-stripping the pace of negotiations.

It is tragic that the elimination of nuclear weapons should have been so delayed as to evade present attempts to devise techniques of detection. It is no less tragic that time has been lost in reaching agreement on measures to control the missile race in its early stages when it might have been possible to arrest the proliferation of rockets through a ban on testing or through a severe limitation of production, or both. Today, measures to control missiles are infinitely more complicated.

Likewise, to guard against surprise attack, inspection measures as originally conceived were intended to provide tactical warning. The advent of missiles has made such a quest extremely dubious. The additional warning time may now be so short that the deterrence may well have been weakened.

These sombre examples of lost opportunities tell us that there is a critical

point in the development of any weapon after which arms control becomes impossible or extremely intricate.

What is the conclusion? Is it not that we must consider it of crucial importance to control new weapons in the very early stages of their development?

We have read with great concern a report in the New York Times of October 12, 1960, of the refinement in Germany and the Netherlands of a technique for the separation of enriched uranium which would make it feasible for any technologically advanced nation to produce atomic weapons without large financial expenditures. This knowledge which is bound to spread, will, in a few years, enable many nations to become nuclear powers. If agreements to prohibit, under international control, the test explosions of nuclear weapons and also the prevention of the wider dissemination of nuclear weapons, are not reached without delay, the inevitable advances in science and technology are bound to inject complicating new factors into the problem of atomic arms control.

To these technical difficulties of finding a solution to the disarmament question has now been added a new and formidable political obstacle. Only last year, the Pakistan delegation had expressed its satisfaction that the Western powers, at long last, had implicitly abandoned their insistence on linking progress in disarmament to political conditions and to the preliminary solution of certain political problems. But now, the Soviet Union insists on linking disarmament with far-reaching political and constitutional changes in the basic structure of the United Nations, aimed at modifying the composition of two of its principal organs, namely, the Security Council and the Secretariat.

Mr. Chairman, these facts underscore more forcefully and eloquently than words the dangers of wasting time which only serve to so compound the political and technical difficulties of the disarmament problem as to make them well-nigh insoluble. Time is of the essence, yes Sir, of the essence, if the quest of general and complete disarmament is not to prove a will-o' the-wisp.

It is against this background of urgency, arising from the fact that technology is continually creating new difficulties more rapidly than the ability of negotiators to resolve old ones, that we must review the present status of disarmament negotiations between the Western powers and the Eastern bloc.

The unanimous adoption by the General Assembly at its fourteenth session of resolution 1378 (XIV) on November 20, 1959, revived our hopes that the great powers would make every effort to achieve a constructive solution of the problem of general and complete disarmament, under effective international control, and measures leading towards this goal would be worked

out in detail and agreed upon in the shortest possible time.

From a study of the records of the Geneva meetings held from March to June this year, it becomes only too painfully clear that the positions of the East and the West did not come close enough to begin drafting specific provisions of a treaty on general and complete disarmament under effective international control. During these months, the negotiators did not come to grips with concrete measures either on disarmament or control. They could not even agree as to whether discussion of a specific measure should begin with its disarmament aspect or its control aspect. Negotiations between the two sides were confined to exchanges of views on certain basic principles of disarmament and control on which their respective proposals were based.

This notwithstanding, the Pakistan delegation is not altogether disappointed with the results of the Geneva negotiations. We note that the debates of the Ten-Nation Disarmament Committee on the proposals of the Western powers on general and complete disarmament of March 16, 1960, and the proposals by the Soviet Government concerning the basic clauses of a treaty on general and complete disarmament of June 2, 1960, led to a significant measure of rapprochement between the two sides on certain basic principles of which this Committee is well aware.

The negotiations were encouraging because of a reconciliation of views of the two sides on these important general principles. In particular, the elaboration in much greater detail of the organization, under effective international control, of phased measures of disarmament to be carried out in stages, and the clarifications given by the Soviet representative of the relevant provisions of the Soviet proposals of June 2, met to a large extent the views of the Western powers in regard to control measures. It is to be noted that the two sides agreed to the chronology of control measures in the following sequence:

(*i*) negotiation of disarmament measures and the corresponding control measures, both general and practical;

(*ii*) signature of a treaty embodying both kinds of measures;

(*iii*) entry into force of the treaty, and, simultaneously, the setting up of the control bodies to implement control measures in step with disarmament measures.

Nevertheless, the positions of the two sides did not entirely converge. The Soviet concessions fell short of willingness to agree to the verification of armed forces and armaments of all types remaining at the disposal of states *after* reduction. The Eastern powers could give no satisfactory assurance in regard to the inclusion of this "major preliminary", as the French representative called it, within the provisions of a disarmament treaty under international control.

It seems to my delegation to be misleading to characterize any proposal

for the verification of armaments remaining at the disposal of states after reductions are carried out as "control of armaments". To our thinking, such verification may well become an essential condition for the exercise of effective control over at least certain measures of disarmament. The Soviet representative maintained that such matters could not be dealt with in the abstract, but must be solved in a concrete way. We feel that disagreements of this nature require careful examination at a technical level by experts before the General Assembly can be expected to express itself on the merits of the opposed stands of the two sides.

Major differences could not be reconciled in the Ten-Nation Disarmament Committee over the question of the time limit for implementing the entire programme of general and complete disarmament and the quantum of reduction of armed forces and armaments, nuclear as well as conventional, appropriate to each of the three stages of the Western proposals of March 16 and the Soviet proposals of June 2, 1960.

Nevertheless, even in these areas, we are happy to observe both sides have shown a certain flexibility of approach. We note that the Eastern powers are ready to relax their stand on the four year time table provided the Western powers agree to fix time limits for each of the three stages of general and complete disarmament and for all of them as a whole.

We also note that the Western powers showed their willingness to fix a reasonable time limit for the implementation of disarmament measures in the first stage, but rejected a time table for the succeeding two stages as impracticable and unrealistic.

On the question of the quantum of reduction of actual armed forces and armaments, conventional and nuclear, appropriate to each of the three stages of disarmament, no real common ground could be established. The Soviet proposals of June 2 contemplated too drastic disarmament in the first two stages, considering the fact that tension between the East and West was rising and deep distrust has permeated their international relations since the Second World War. While the Soviet proposals postponed initial measures of conventional disarmament from the first to the second stage to accommodate the Western powers, they went to the extreme in calling for the complete elimination of all vehicles and means of delivering weapons of mass destruction, the withdrawal of foreign troops, and other such measures as the very first steps in the first stage of a disarmament treaty. Furthermore, the Soviet proposals called for the complete elimination of weapons of mass destruction as the first step in the second stage. The Western powers, on the other hand, have persistently maintained that the final elimination of such weapons and the means of their delivery should be carried out only in the third and last stage of any programme of general and complete disarmament under effective international control.

It is not only fear and distrust that interpose themselves as obstacles to the elimination of nuclear and other weapons of mass destruction in an early stage. All of us are only too conscious of the fact that for the last few years, both sides have acknowledged that no known scientific techniques of inspection have yet been evolved to detect stockpiles of nuclear weapons that may be concealed by either side to evade international control. It was for this reason that the approach to the problem of disarmament was shifted by the General Assembly from comprehensive measures to those of a partial nature as set forth in resolution 1148(XII) of November 14, 1957, until such time as a scientific break-through would make a more effective detection system feasible. The claim implicit in the Khrushchev plan of general and complete disarmament of September 18, 1959, and its subsequent revisions as presented to the Ten-Nation Disarmament Committee on June 7, 1960, and to the present session of the General Assembly on September 23, 1960, is that in these schemes, the difficulties of control, such as the detection of clandestine stocks of nuclear weapons, will disappear because all means of delivering them to their targets will have been eliminated.

Mr. Chairman, the Pakistan delegation is in no position to express any opinion on the validity or otherwise of this claim, and of the Soviet approach to the problem of eliminating all obstacles to the establishment of an effective international control system. This subject bristles with technicalities into which it would be fruitless for my delegation to enter. We do consider, however, that the importance of the problem of control is such as to be of decisive significance to any scheme of general and complete disarmament. It is therefore a question which needs to be referred without delay to experts—scientific, military, and administrative—for their examination and report, if the goal of a disarmed world is to be reached with the shortest possible delay.

In view of the uncertain outlook for an effective system of international control, the Pakistan delegation is not surprised that the Western proposals including the United States programme for general and complete disarmament under effective international control of June 27, 1960, (which could not be submitted to the Ten-Nation Disarmament Committee at Geneva because it was broken up before this could be done) envisage a too modest measure of disarmament in the earlier stages. In regard to the reluctance of the Western powers to agree to any definite time limit in advance for the implementation of the entire programme of general and complete disarmament, we consider that this question should be examined in the light of the conclusions of experts on the feasibility of devising an effective inspection system to guard against the possibility of concealment of nuclear weapons.

Mr. Chairman, to turn from this retrospective analysis to the prospect before us, the General Assembly is now confronted with a situation in which

the principal parties to the disarmament negotiations remain deeply divided in their approach to this most serious of all problems, namely, general and complete disarmament. The Eastern powers have been insisting that the entire range of general and complete disarmament must be negotiated as a whole, from the first stage to the last, before anything concrete can be done about specific disarmament measures. They have shown no disposition to consider any alternative to this global approach such as that suggested by the Western powers to adopt certain partial or initial measures, not in isolation, but as integral parts of a continuous programme of general and complete disarmament.

From a comparison of the Western proposals of June 27, 1960, circulated by the United States, and those of the Soviet Union of June 2, 1960, as well as the latter's revised version presented by Chairman Khrushchev to the General Assembly earlier in the present session, it would appear to my delegation that the most hopeful prospects of early implementation of disarmament measures under effective international control as integral parts of a programme of general and complete disarmament, relate to the following:

One Cessation of the production of fissionable material for weapons purposes and the transfer of agreed quantities of such material from past production to non-weapons uses;

Two Prior notification of proposed launching of missiles as an immediate step to reduce the risk of war by accident or miscalculation;

Three Appropriate measures to give greater protection against surprise attack as an initial step towards safeguarding the world against such attack;

Four The prevention of the wider dissemination of nuclear weapons in accordance with General Assembly resolution 1380 (XIV) of November 20, 1959.

Mr. Chairman, my delegation feels that the immediate implementation of the initial steps that I have just mentioned would not by any means militate against the continuance of parallel negotiations between the principal parties on the more substantial and important measures which are central to the proposals for general and complete disarmament. We believe that in the prevailing climate of fear and distrust of motives and intentions between the East and the West, a modest approach would seem to have a better chance of bearing result. Initial agreements on peripheral issues would act as a catalyst in the process of promoting some degree of confidence between the parties and thereby improve the prospects of wider agreements on problems which lie at the heart of general and complete disarmament. If, on the other hand, we reject this approach in the situation confronting us when the two sides have failed to evolve a mutually agreed

basis for further negotiations, the process of disarmament is not likely to even get started.

In addition to the above initial steps, the Pakistan delegation ventures to express the opinion that certain other measures relating to the reduction of armed forces and conventional armaments could well be added to those that I have enumerated. We feel that greater substance could well be given to the content of the first stage of disarmament in the United States proposal of June 2 without violating the principle of balance between nuclear and conventional measures, and also the basic rule that no country or group of countries shall obtain, at any stage, a significant military advantage over the others, as a result of disarmament. Hence we would appeal to both sides to find a basis for compromise between their respective proposals for the reduction of the armed forces of the United States and the Soviet Union in the first stage and also for the reduction of conventional armaments to related levels and the elimination of stocks thus released. The Soviet Union now proposes that the armed forces of the two powers should be reduced to 1.7 million each in the first stage. The United States has agreed to this figure in the second stage. Since the Western powers regard the first two stages of their disarmament plans as not so much separate than a single continuing process, would it be too much to expect that an agreed figure between 2.7 and 1.7 million could be mutually agreed upon by the two sides to achieve a measure of real disarmament at the very outset?

Mr. Chairman, the Pakistan delegation has consistently maintained since 1955 that meaningful disarmament to all the member states of the United Nations except, perhaps, to the three nuclear powers connotes the reduction of armed forces and conventional armaments to enable them to reduce their military expenditures and to divert the greater part of their financial resources into productive channels. In particular, the under-developed countries of Asia, Africa, and Latin America which account for two billion people or two thirds of the population of the world, have no foreseeable prospects of being able to raise the living standards of their peoples to decent levels except through the diversion of the resources of the richer nations of the world as well as of their own from armaments to development. Hence the universal importance of a substantial measure of immediate world wide conventional disarmament under effective international control needs no emphasis as an economic measure, quite apart from its intrinsic merit in a disarmament scheme.

It was our great stake in the beneficial economic consequences of disarmament that prompted Pakistan to introduce jointly with Mexico and Costa Rica an amendment to the draft resolution on disarmament in this committee during the tenth session of the General Assembly which is to be

found in operative paragraph 3 of resolution 914(X). This paragraph calls for a study of the proposals originated by the Prime Minister of France for the allocation of funds resulting from disarmament for improving the standards of living throughout the world, and in particular the under-developed countries.

I need not dilate on the need to start some measure of real disarmament without delay, if the great and growing disparities between the rich and the poor nations of the world are not to develop into a new source of international tension. This potential North-South conflict, as it is sometimes called, may, if not prevented in time, add new dangers to those of the cold war.

Mr. Chairman, in endorsing the proposition that general and complete disarmament must start with those measures which are capable of early implementation under effective international control, the Pakistan delegation is by no means suggesting an approach that is reflected in the earlier resolutions of the General Assembly, notable 1148 (XII) of November 14, 1957, adopted at its twelfth session. This resolution shifted the perspective of disarmament from comprehensive to partial measures. What we now submit is that while parallel negotiations take place with the object of concluding a treaty on general and complete disarmament, such disarmament measures as may be immediately capable of implementation like those mentioned by my delegation earlier should not be delayed until complete agreement is reached on the whole complex of measures within the scope of such a treaty.

In the statements that have been made in the course of the general debate, many distinguished statesmen including certain heads of state and government have expressed similar views. My delegation has been impressed by the general consensus which has emerged in favour of negotiations on disarmament measures progressively according to the possibility of their early implementation.

We are well aware that in respect of even these measures much remains to be done in the way of studying the complex technical and administrative aspects of their implementation under effective international control. The time has, therefore, come to appoint panels of technical experts to study and report to an appropriate organ of the United Nations on the intricate and inter-related scientific, technical, and administrative aspects of implementation. In particular, the General Assembly needs to know whether the effectiveness of control will be seriously impaired if verification is restricted to reductions of armed forces and armaments and not extended to what remains at the disposal of states after reductions are carried out. Furthermore, even in regard to measures which do not, strictly speaking, involve reductions, for example, the question of minimizing the possibility of surprise attack, technical-military studies need to be resumed from the point at which they were discontinued in the experts conference which suspended its meetings on

December 18, 1958. It is the task of technical-military experts to assemble the facts necessary for evaluating the effectiveness of various systems of inspection and observation and to draw the necessary conclusions.

More especially, my delegation considers it absolutely essential for the General Assembly to be given objective and authoritative findings by experts of recognized competence as to the feasibility or otherwise of effective control over the initial measures of disarmament within the context of a programme of general and complete disarmament. Only in this way will the Assembly be able to exercise its judgment on the issues involved and play a useful role in finding solutions to the manifold and complex problems of which it is seized in the disarmament field.

In this context, may we be permitted to recall that three years ago, at the twelfth session of the General Assembly, the delegations of Norway and Pakistan sponsored an amendment in this committee, to the twenty-four power joint draft resolution on disarmament, recommending the establishment of groups of technical experts to study inspection systems for disarmament measures on which the five-power sub-committee of the then Disarmament Commission might reach agreement in principle, and to report to the sub-committee within a fixed period. The amendment envisaged that the groups would include not only experts drawn from the major powers, but also from wherever the most qualified persons were available among member states of the organization. The Norway-Pakistan amendment was accepted by the twenty-four sponsors and is to be found in paragraphs 3 and 4 of resolution 1148 (XII). In the thirteenth session, my delegation suggested in this committee that the great powers should extend the technical approach which had been initiated, earlier in 1958, on the problems of suspension of nuclear weapons tests and the measures to prevent surprise attack, also to the study of the technical problems involved in the possible reduction of armed forces and conventional armaments. Resolution 1252 (XIII) of November 4, 1959, again recommended the technical approach with a view to contributing to a balanced and effectively controlled world-wide system of disarmament.

We regret that the two-year deadlock since 1957, on the procedure and substance of the disarmament negotiations between the great powers represented in the sub-committee prevented the implementation of the General Assembly recommendations in regard to the panels of experts and the technical approach for finding answers to the technical aspects of disarmament.

I now turn to the task before the General Assembly in the present session. The question of disarmament has become one of transcendent importance to humanity. The peoples of the world are looking to the United Nations to ease the tensions between the East and the West. It is the duty of all

member states, but first and foremost of the great powers, to deflect mankind from a course which can only lead to death or at best to an existence of fear and want.

We cannot, we must not believe that they will fail.

As yet, there is no reason for despair. We believe that both the East and the West are ready to resume their interrupted negotiations. The General Assembly *must*, with all the force of its political and moral authority, *demand, nay insist*, that the two sides undertake further discussions on the proposals for general and complete disarmament under effective international control in order to achieve a constructive solution of this problem within the shortest possible time. The General Assembly must now reinforce the call of the Disarmament Commission in its resolution of August 19, 1960, for the earliest possible continuation of the disarmament negotiations. In our view, neither this nor that great power is morally entitled to make its participation in the disarmament talks conditional on the acceptance of its demands. Such an attitude would be incompatible with its special responsibility under the charter of our organization for the maintenance of world peace.

From the review of the negotiations which took place in Geneva this year, my delegation is persuaded that a start towards the goal of general and complete disarmament should not be held up until complete agreement is reached on the entire range and depth of the measures within its scope. A start must be made even before this stage, and as soon as possible, with those measures which are capable of early implementation under effective international control and are also compatible with the basic principle of balance in order that no country or group of countries will obtain, at any stage, a significant military advantage. We believe that the Ten-Nation Disarmament Committee should give priority to such measures in the performance of its task.

Suggestions have been made to alter the composition of the committee in the expectation that this will yield more profitable results. We for our part are inclined to share the view that the crisis before us is not so much that of procedure as of the substance of the problem of disarmament. Above all, it is a crisis of confidence. Nevertheless, if the general consensus is in favour of enlarging the membership of the Ten-Nation Disarmament Committee so as to make it more fully representative of the geographical regions of the world and of different shades of political opinion, the Pakistan delegation will, of course, support any suitable proposal to this end. More especially, my delegation would again endorse the suggestion made by the Secretary of State for External Affairs of Canada in the Disarmament Commission last August—which we strongly supported in that forum—that the committee might benefit from having a neutral chairman who could regularize the order of business. It gives my delegation particular pleasure to reiterate our view that the distinguished Chairman of the Disarmament Com-

mission, Ambassador Padilla Nervo of Mexico would be the most suitable choice for the important office. His experience and knowledge of negotiations on the subject, his qualities as a conciliator and harmonizer of conflicting opinions in this field and his profound interest in, and concern for disarmament, should with advantage to our organization be enlisted in the service of peace.

While in the context of the task before the General Assembly in the present session my delegation deems it necessary to comment briefly on the suggestion made for a special session of the General Assembly in March or April next year to be attended by heads of states and governments to consider the problem of disarmament and also with regard to the demand for fundamental changes in the structure of certain principal organs of the United Nations.

Mr. Chairman, the varieties of disarmament are stubborn facts which cannot be ignored by procedural tactics. They demand respectful recognition. It still remains a fact of international life that no success can be achieved in the field of disarmament unless the great armed powers have the desire and the will to reach agreement. Where these are lacking, nothing positive can be accomplished. The truth of this statement was demonstrated only a few weeks ago, when the General Assembly failed to persuade the President of the United States and the Chairman of the Council of Ministers of the Soviet Union to resume their interrupted contacts. A special session of the General Assembly to consider the question of disarmament must certainly have its place in the scheme of things when the great powers will have achieved sufficient reconciliation of their conflicting positions to warrant hopes of a constructive outcome from such a meeting. At the present stage, the question is rather premature.

The same must be said of the demand for radical changes in the secretariat of the United Nations. The question of who should command an international peace force in a disarmed world will remain unreal so long as the world refuses to take a single step to disarm.

Mr. Chairman, may I, at this stage of my intervention, ask for your indulgence in extending my observations to the three draft resolutions relating to the subject under discussion which have already been circulated by their sponsors.

Document A/C I/L 251 setting forth the draft resolution on the report of the Disarmament Commission and sponsored by the United Kingdom delegation recommends the appointment of technical, scientific, military, and administrative experts, with instructions to submit a progress report on the systems of inspection and control in relation to disarmament measures which must form an integral part of a programme of general and complete disarmament, including those measures which are capable of early imple-

mentation. We welcome this constructive initiative on the part of the United Kingdom which was foreshadowed in the statement of Prime Minister Macmillan to the General Assembly on September 29, 1960. The step now proposed by the United Kingdom delegation has been long overdue. We note in particular that it calls for a study of the technical feasibility of control to ensure the progressive reduction and elimination of weapons of mass destruction and the means of their delivery including the clandestine storage of nuclear weapons which, as I have said earlier, lie at the heart of the problem of general and complete disarmament. We note further that this draft resolution also calls for a study of the problems of control which have arisen in connection with those measures of disarmament which are capable of early implementation. The United Kingdom proposal is thus in line with the general tenor of the observations that I have made earlier.

There are four features in the United Kingdom proposal which should recommend themselves to this committee. First, political negotiation between the principal parties are not to be delayed until the results of the expert studies have been made available. The Ten-Nation Disarmament Committee will be enabled to proceed with its task simultaneously. Second, the experts will be expected to submit a progress report within a definite time-limit, six months, in order to ensure that the talks are not prolonged indefinitely. Third, the experts must submit their progress report to the Disarmament Commission. This provision is a significant forward step towards bringing back disarmament discussions within the framework of the United Nations. At the same time, it will provide the commission with an opportunity of playing a much more active role in the future than it has been able to do in the past. Lastly, the entire exercise on the subject of inspection and control has been placed in its proper proportion and perspective by instructing the experts to confine their examination to the scientific, technical, and administrative aspects of control. It is thus acknowledged that technical talks are no substitute for political negotiations which alone can ensure agreement between the East and the West on the disarmament problem.

The Pakistan Delegation will vote in favour of the United Kingdom draft resolution, A/C I/L 251.

There are two other draft resolutions before the Political Committee, namely, that of the Soviet Union—A/C I/L 249 and the one sponsored by three Western powers—Italy, the United Kingdom and the United States—A/C I/L 250.

If the two draft resolutions are studied together, it will be seen that the positions of the two sides have come somewhat closer together, notably in regard to the principle of specified time limits for the implementation of disarmament measures. Both the draft proposals attempt a definition of the goal of general and complete disarmament in terms which, in spite of com-

missions and omissions, are very similar. Nevertheless, on closer scrutiny, the differences of approach to the common goal which I pointed out earlier still persist. The emphasis in the Soviet draft is definitely on the conclusion of a treaty which will include the entire range of programme of general and complete disarmament. The Western powers on the other hand stress a start towards this goal with those measures which are capable of early implementation under effective international control.

In regard to the general principles which should guide negotiations between the two sides, the two drafts have much in common, but important differences remain. In particular, it is very clear that the disagreement in the Ten-Nation Disarmament Committee over the extension of verification to armed forces and armaments remaining at the disposal of states is brought out sharply in the Western draft resolution. There are also other differences. The Soviet draft would have the General Assembly recognize a change in the structure of the United Nations as necessary to create confidence in the correct use of international armed forces when general and complete disarmament becomes an accomplished fact. Furthermore, the Soviet proposal would throw open participation in the international control organization and the international armed forces to all states. On the other hand, the Western draft conceives of them within the framework of the organization.

We consider the three-power Western draft resolution as being in accord with the substance of our views on the present status of the disarmament question as set forth by me earlier.

Mr. Chairman, the Pakistan delegation would regard it as a happy augury to the success of the disarmament negotiations if the East and the West would evolve a common text between themselves of a joint draft resolution as they did last year to enable the General Assembly to follow the precedent of adopting it unanimously.

Mr. Chairman, the problem of disarmament has been discussed by the United Nations for fifteen years. All this time, the various principal and subsidiary organs in which the subject has been dealt with have concerned themselves exclusively with its political and military aspects. They have given no thought to its economic and social consequences. And yet the national and international impact of disarmament may be of such dimensions as to revolutionise the world economic situation.

A substantial reduction of military expenditures is bound to set in motion changes in the domestic economies of states and in international economic relations. For example, in respect of the former, nations disbanding their armed forces and halting the production of weapons and implements of war will be faced with the problem of maintaining demand at its fomer level by mobilising in time the alternative public and private expenditures which theoretically could replace defense expenditures. The under-developed

countries may have to bear even greater economic burden from a decline in the demand for their raw materials. Compensatory measures in the form of tax reductions and international economic development would become imperative to bolster national and world economies. There will also arise the transfer problem of absorbing human and material resources released from a war economy into a system of stable peace. The scope and nature of this problem may be quite different in countries enjoying a free economy than in those under central planning systems. Its difficulties would be greater for some countries which maintain large forces in relation to their resources than for those which devote a much smaller percentage of their national product for military purposes. These are some of the economic problems that are merely indicative of the economic impact of disarmament. They pose questions vital to national and international economic life. Yet their study has been neglected for fifteen years.

There are also other important reasons why a scientific and objective analysis of the economic and social consequences of disarmament is both urgent and imperative. Widespread fear exists in many nations lest a reversal of the arms race may lead to a world wide economic crisis. These fears influence in varying degrees the public policies of the governments of the world and impede the growth of public opinion in favour of disarmament. Such fears need to be dispelled if the full support of the peoples of the world is to be mobilised in the crusade to prevent a nuclear holocaust. Disarmament, like peace, must begin in the minds of men.

The Pakistan delegation firmly believes that the time is ripe for a comprehensive study of the economic and social consequences of disarmament for the world. We have reached a stage in disarmament negotiations when we dare to propose time-limits for implementing measures of partial or complete disarmament. The Pakistan delegation, for one, would repulse the thought that such proposals may not have been introduced with serious intentions. Is it not then timely to devote some thinking to a subject of the most vital importance to the well-being of all the peoples of the world?

The study that we have in mind is not to be confused with the suggestions made in the past in connection with the flow of savings to the under-developed countries for purposes of economic development in the event of disarmament. In as far as these savings are concerned, a study project on their best utilisation should await definite information as to the size and time of availability of these funds if it is not to be based on purely hypothetical calculations.

The suggestion which my delegation would like to make must be viewed in a larger perspective. It is of greater scope and depth. It relates not to the economic development of under-developed countries as a result of disarmament but to the economic adjustment of all countries to disarmament.

It does not ask for a blueprint but only for broad conclusions. The study must examine whether fears of an economic depression from a reversal of the arms race are or are not justified.

A task of this nature can best be undertaken by the secretariat of the United Nations. So far as we are aware, no comprehensive systematic study exists on the subject of economic adjustments to the impact of disarmament. Its compilation by the United Nations would meet an urgent need of governments and non-governmental organizations throughout the world. The imprimatur of the organisation would command wide acceptance of its findings.

In carrying out this task the secretariat will no doubt seek and enlist the active co-operation of governments on which it must necessarily depend for much of the required information and data pertaining to military expenditures and to industries and projects connected with defence. It may engage the services of consultants of recognized competence and representative of the main schools of economic thought.

The Pakistan delegation is fully conscious of the fact that the resources of the secretariat, both in terms of personnel and services, are fully stretched by the existing work programmes to which it is committed, and even more so by the emergency operation in the Congo. But the task which we have suggested is one of vital importance and urgency. It must, therefore, be executed as a matter of priority, with the assurance, if needed, of the necessary budgetary support.

Address to the Twelve Hundred and Twentieth Plenary Meeting of the United Nations General Assembly on September 30, 1963 (Forenoon Session)

Mr. President,

It is my privilege to convey to you the warmest congratulations of the delegation of Pakistan on your unanimous election to the high office of President of the eighteenth session of the General Assembly of the United Nations. Beyond the formal ties of diplomatic relations between your great country and mine lie the intangible bonds of shared attitudes and aspirations which constitute a firm basis of friendship between Pakistan and Venezuela and the vast continent to which your country belongs. I am confident that under your wise and skilful guidance this Assembly, which is meeting in a time of hope and expectation, will advance mankind toward the fulfilment of the ideals for which this organization was established. These ideals revolve around one central purpose: the attainment and preservation of world peace.

Peace alone can ensure human survival and progress. Such peace as the world enjoys today is precarious and uncertain, maintained only by the knowledge that nuclear war will end not in victory but in mutual annihilation. Yet the great powers hold in readiness immense stores of weapons and engines of destruction which serve only to increase tension and mutual suspicion. The first necessity, therefore, is to put an immediate end to this dangerous and self-defeating arms race in which the great powers have been engaged for more than a decade. Ever since the end of the Second World War the United Nations has been preoccupied with this fundamental problem.

The decision of the General Assembly adopted three years ago, setting the aim of general and complete disarmament, was an important new deve-

lopment in the search for an enduring peace. However, the subsequent record of the negotiations has not been encouraging. Stockpiles of nuclear weapons and the means of their delivery have not ceased to multiply. The Eighteen Nation Disarmament Committee which has been dealing with this urgent problem has made little progress. That this should be so is no reflection on the endeavours and the good faith of its members. One has only to study the contributions made by many of them to appreciate the value of the Geneva discussions.

May I state, however, that the non-representation in this forum of certain militarily significant states in the world imparts to its deliberations a degree of unreality. If disarmament is to be general and complete it must obviously be universal. No significant military power, much less a major military power, can be excluded from the scope of its implementation. Nor can it be expected that it would accept the obligation of a disarmament treaty negotiated without its representation.

The treaty to prohibit the testing of nuclear weapons in the atmosphere, under the water and outer space, comes as a ray of light in a dark horizon. Our children and generations yet unborn have been safeguarded against the future poisoning of the air they breathe, the water they drink and the food they eat.

In the dark ages, when unwanted children were buried alive, the Prophet Muhammad cried out in wrath: "What will you answer when the innocents that you have slain rise before God's judgement seat and ask, 'For what crime were we slain'?".

Let us hope that by this treaty our progeny and succeeding generations will be safeguarded against the agony of a living death. But as a measure of disarmament the test ban treaty is important more for what it promises than for what it has achieved. As has been well said, it is but the first step on a thousand-mile journey. It does not prohibit underground tests, it does not halt the nuclear arms race, much less reverse it.

At the time of adhering to the treaty, the Government of Pakistan expressed the strong hope that the prohibition of testing would be followed soon by agreements to cease underground tests also and to prevent the future spread of nuclear weapons. Unless these and other measures of nuclear disarmament are taken, the test ban treaty, although welcome in itself, may turn out to be of only illusory value in dissipating the fear of nuclear war from the minds of men. My government attaches the highest importance and priority to the prevention of the spread of nuclear weapons as a next step in the quest for general and complete disarmament under effective international control.

In this regard, President Mohammad Ayub Khan gave expression to the concern of Pakistan in his address to the seventeenth session of the General

Assembly in the following words:

"An aspect of disarmament which is of deep concern to Pakistan is the clear and present danger of the spread of nuclear weapons and the knoweldge of their technology to states which do not now possess them. The General Assembly is aware of this danger. Permit me to observe that the mere adoption of resolutions against the dissemination of nuclear weapons and in favour of the establishment of a non-nuclear club, will not remove this danger. Unless the United Nations takes effective and urgent action in this direction, the race in nuclear armaments is bound to overtake other parts of the world in the immediate future."

In the reluctance of some member states to accept the safeguard system devised by the International Atomic Energy Agency, we find cause for grave concern, particularly when the aversion to agency safeguards is accompanied by the priority plans to produce elements essential to the manufacture of nuclear weapons. Time and again the agency has drawn attention to the increase in the number of countries reaching the stage of nuclear capability and the danger of such capability being diverted to war-like purposes. We support the decision of the Governing Board of the International Atomic Engery Agency to recommend extension of its safeguards to nuclear reactors exceeding the capacity of 100 thermal megawatts and to study the question of applying safeguards to equipment. The great merit of international safeguards, as compared to bilateral safeguards, is that, being uninfluenced by political expediencies, they inspire greater world-wide confidence. The objective of an effective system of safeguards should be to insure, by inspection and verification at every stage of the process, from the designing and manufacture of the reactor equipment to the disposal of nuclear material, that atomic power intended for peaceful use will not and cannot be used for other purposes.

While basic differences of both a qualitative as well as quantitative nature continue to persist on the substantive issues of general and complete disarmament and on measures for effective international control, the negotiations in Geneva do seem to my delegation to have opened prospects of limited steps which can be taken immediately. In the past, much controversy existed between the merits of a partial approach to disarmament as against attempts to deal with the problem in a comprehensive manner. We trust that with the conclusion of the test ban treaty, pragmatic good sense will prevail over doctrinaire considerations. My delegation believes that at this stage, the Eighteen Nation Disarmament Committee could profitably devote itself to the task of reaching agreements on such limited measures as the prevention of surprise attack and the placing in orbit or stationing in outer space of weapons of mass destruction. We welcome, in this connexion, the recent agreement between the United States and the Soviet Union for

peaceful co-operation in outer space. The United States and the Soviet Union have also indicated their readiness to make mutual concessions in order to facilitate agreements on measures to prevent surprise attack and war by accident. In particular, my delegation welcomes the proposal to establish inspection posts at the main points of concentration and movements of military forces in the NATO and Warsaw Pact countries. We hope these limited steps in disarmament, and other measures such as the reduction of military expenditures and the release of an agreed proportion of funds thus saved for the purpose of economic and technical assistance to the developing countries, could be taken in the atmosphere created by the conclusion of the test ban treaty.

As the speakers who have preceded me have pointed out this Assembly meets in an atmosphere of good-will and hope. We are encouraged by the constructive statements addressed to the Assembly by President Kennedy and the Foreign Minister of the Soviet Union. These statements contain concrete proposals which we hope will provide a basis for serious negotiations among the interested powers and contribute to a further amelioration of the situation. We see in the test ban treaty a sign and a symbol of the will of the Soviet Union and the Western powers for peaceful co-existence. President Kennedy and Chairman Khrushchev looked into the abyss and stepped back from it. We are told that there is no possibility of co-existence in the ideological field. Nevertheless, as statesmen, they cannot want nuclear war. Their enlightened self-interest demands that they re-establish sanity in the world because the two superstates whose destinies they guide must recognize the limits of their power.

The world is asking itself the question: Will the test ban treaty be a turning-point in history? We cannot see past the veil which obscures the future. Dangerous questions are still outstanding. There has been no change as yet in the position of the East and the West on Viet-Nam, Laos, Germany, Berlin and Cuba, even though their frozen positions have somewhat melted. Nevertheless, the world is breathing with relief the new atmosphere of a limited detente which is unmistakable. We pray that in culmination of the current trend a mutually acceptable *modus vivendi* may be reached between the great powers.

Apart from the East-West tension, serious problems persist and continue to poison relations among nations. As President Kennedy said here the other day, the cold war is not the only expression of tension in this world and the nuclear race is not the only arms race.

In Africa the death-spasm of colonialism and the obstinate pursuit of the false doctrine of racial superiority kindle the embers of old fears and hates. In the Caribbean, which last year brought the world to the brink of catastrophe, there is yet no peace but only a precarious truce. But it is in Asia, with

its stormy history, that peace is perhaps the least secure. This vast and ancient continent, inhabited by more than half of the population of our planet, continues to be the scene of great convulsions which may well change the destiny of mankind. The giant has awakened, still hardly conscious of its strength but capable, as in the past, of setting in motion forces and events that could change the course of world history. From end to end, from the Pacific to the Mediterranean, there is tumult and conflict. Neighbour is set against neighbour, people divided by war and diplomacy are made the pawns of forces beyond their control. In Viet-Nam and in Korea, in Laos, in Palestine and in the sub-continent of India and Pakistan, there exist bitter disputes and explosive situations which disturb the tranquillity of Asia and the peace of the world. Is it not time to take a new look at the state of this largest of all the continents and to devise an approach that looks beyond the policies of maintaining the *status quo* and is in accordance with the right of self-determination of peoples? For the well-being of the teeming masses of Asia and for the sake of the peace of the world it is imperative to find just solutions to the disputes that divide Asian nations.

Among these disputes the Kashmir question has a dimension and an importance of its own, involving, as it does, the future of 550 million people of Pakistan and India, the largest concentration of population next to that of China, and more than one-sixth of the human race. Estranged from each other, the two countries must remain the chief source of danger to the stability of the Asian continent. Reconciled, they have it in their power to assure the future of a large segment of mankind.

While this is no occasion for me to attempt a presentation of the Kashmir question in detail, I must yet remind the Assembly that the central issue in the dispute is that of self-determination. Pakistan seeks no other solution than that of the free exercise of this right by the people of Kashmir.

This principle was accepted by both parties to the dispute. Its implementation has been blocked by one party. We now hear it said that India has made no such commitment. We know, of course, that the easiest way to repudiate a commitment is to deny that it was ever made. However, the commitment, the pledge, the word of honour are on public record, which may sometimes be forgotten but can never be expunged. Furthermore, the commitment is not of a vague and general nature, made in some pious declaration, but is explicitly embodied in an international agreement as set forth in the two United Nations resolutions which were solemnly accepted by India and Pakistan and which constituted the basis for the cessation of hostilities in Kashmir. Could any commitment be clearer than the very first article of the resolution of January 5, 1949:

> "The question of the accession of the State of Jammu and Kashmir to India or Pakistan will be decided through the democratic method of a

free and impartial plebiscite"?

The pledge, that the future of Kashmir shall be determined in accordance with the will of the people as freely expressed, was given not to the United Nations but directly by India to Pakistan. Again, what could be clearer than the following declaration of the Prime Minister of India in his communication of October 31, 1947, addressed to the Prime Minister of Pakistan:

"Our assurance that we shall withdraw our troops from Kashmir as soon as peace and order are restored and leave the decision regarding the future of this state to the people of the state is not merely a promise to your Government but also to the people of Kashmir and to the world"?

Was any international commitment ever more clearly made, so consistently repeated, and yet more wilfully dishonoured?

Sometimes, rather than deny the commitment, India's representatives contend that there were conditions attached to the commitment which were not fulfilled and that Pakistan did not fulfil those conditions. We have said repeatedly that we are prepared to accept any impartial third-party verdict on this issue. It is India which makes an allegation and then refuses to submit it to impartial investigation.

Against the background of the assurances that I have quoted, it will not be difficult to appreciate the concern of the Government of Pakistan, and the indignation of our people, when the Prime Minister of India, as in his statement of August 13, 1963, talks of the idea of a plebiscite as being "old and discarded".

Pakistan seeks no concession but the right of the people of Kashmir to settle their own future. Let me state clearly and unambiguously from this rostrum that we shall not, now or ever, barter away the rights of the people of Kashmir in return of a settlement on the basis of a division of spoils.

The Kashmir dispute remains the basic cause of conflict between Pakistan and India. The other frictions and differences between the two countries are not comparable in magnitude and gravity to this essential issue which impinges on the viability and future of Pakistan itself. We are confident that all the other outstanding problems between us and our neighbour can be settled amicably if only the Kashmir quarrel is settled.

For more than a year relations between Pakistan and India have been further aggravated by the expulsion of tens of thousands of Muslim citizens of India from their homes in the States of Assam and Tripura across the border into East Pakistan. This problem is being discussed by the two governments through diplomatic channels. It is our earnest hope that it will be resolved in accordance with law and the principles of justice.

It is a cardinal principle of the foreign policy of Pakistan to live in peace and friendship with all its neighbours, without exception. With some of

them we have had differences. We have been largely successful in composing them. We have concluded boundary agreements with Burma, India, Iran, and the People's Republic of China, which have resolved border disputes on the basis of mutual accommodation and friendship.

No country regrets more deeply than mine the outbreak of the border conflict between its two giant neighbours, China and India. This conflict has been a matter of deep and direct concern to us. Its repercussions have complicated the problem of our own security. We believe that this dispute can be resolved peacefully. A solution by war is inconceivable; it carries the risk of escalating into a much wider conflict. It is therefore with deep apprehension that we view the radical alteration in the delicate military balance of the region by the augmentation of India's military strength. Our fears of the resulting danger to the security of Pakistan are not purely psychological; they are deeply rooted in history and flow from the evidence of India's readiness to resort to military force to settle disputes with its neighbours. Similar fears have also been voiced in other countries of the region.

Pakistan bears no ill will to the people of India. With the people of India, the people of Pakistan have shared a common history for nearly thousand years. During this long period they have influenced each other in many ways. These facts are central in our awareness. They inform our policy towards our neighbour. We are ever ready to continue the search for a basis of peaceful and honourable co-existence through an equitable settlement of all our mutual differences, of which by far the most important is Kashmir.

If war and violence are to be banished, then ways must be found to solve international disputes peacefully. The world we live in is passing through a period of transition and conflict. There are disputes between nations, there are struggles against domination, there are problems created by racial discrimination and by the existence of economic imbalances between nations. These are the tribulations of our age. The United Nations was established not to perpetuate privilege, but to ensure that, through peaceful change, a world community might be evolved in which no nation will dominate or rise against another.

The domination of one people by another is no new phenomenon; however, the organized form which it has taken under the system of colonialism is perhaps unique in the history of the world. The most pernicious aspect of colonial rule is that economic exploitation, which is its basic purpose, was sought to be concealed under the notion of the superiority of one race over another whether as reflected in the brutal form of apartheid or in the more subtle doctrine of civilizing nations, holding empire over distant lands for the selfless purpose of training their backward peoples in the arts of life.

The bitter legacy of these ideas will, we hope, disappear with the final disappearance of colonialism. In the newly-independent countries of Africa one sees today men of all races working together in mutual respect and to mutual advantage.

In South Africa alone, the doctrine of racial discrimination is proclaimed as the official philosophy of the state. The rulers of that unhappy country, blind to the evidence of their eyes, deaf to the appeals of the world, and ignoring the march of history, have attempted to halt its course. South Africa could become the hope of Africa; its rulers have chosen to make it the shame of the world. For many years mankind has hoped and prayed that good sense and reason would prevail in South Africa over prejudice and folly. Let us pray that the time for hope is not past, for the ordeal which the South African Government has imposed upon all its people can result only in a victory for hate and chaos.

But let us not court disaster by the fond hope that the moral pressure of appeals made year after year by this Assembly will deflect the South African Government from its fatal course. The interests of the peoples of South Africa, be they white, black or brown, and of the peace and tranquillity of Africa and of the world demand that effective measures be taken to check the inhuman policies of South Africa and to avert disaster.

We welcome the decision of the Security Council calling for an embargo on the sale of any kind of arms to South Africa. We hope that, in their own true interest, all those countries whose close political and commercial links with South Africa place them in a position to put effective pressure on the racist regime will not hesitate too long before doing so. The Pakistan delegation is in full sympathy with the efforts that are being made by the General Assembly and its organs to exert pressures on South Africa to develop a multiracial community in which:

> ". . . the social and legal structures would be dedicated to equality of all before the law, and to the participation of all ethnic groups on an equal footing, in economic, social, cultural and political activities."

All over the world one sees colonialism giving way to relationship between nations based on equality and mutual respect. It is our earnest hope that the Governments of the United Kingdom and the other Administering Authorities will continue to follow the path of wisdom in granting self-government and independence to the remaining Non-Self-Governing Territories under their administration, in accordance with the aspirations of the peoples concerned.

It is a matter of the deepest regret that Portugal persists in an attitude which is contrary to the trend of history and at variance with Portugal's own great past. When the colonial systems of the other European powers are in the process of total dissolution, it is contrary to the laws of life to

expect that Portuguese rule in Africa will not pass away. We pray that the leaders of Portugal who have set their country against the world, will have the vision to see where lie its true interests in Africa and in the world.

In this context, the General Assembly must take note of a historic event which took place in May of this year. Heads of state of thirty-two African countries met in Addis Ababa and pledged themselves with remarkable unanimity to take active measures in order to liberate the remaining dependent territories in that continent. The conference adopted a Pan-African charter and established a consultative machinery. The Pakistan delegation hails this event as the manifestation of Africa's urge to political unity and the consciousness of a Pan-African community. A historian of antiquity has observed that out of Africa there always comes something new. The nations of Asia, and even those of Europe, which are yet lacking in a similar kind of consciousness of their continents must applaud the peoples of Africa for setting them an example. Pakistan wishes God-speed to free Africa in its search for continental unity.

Eight years ago, in the beautiful city of Bandung, twenty-nine independent states of Asia and Africa met together in the first inter-continental conference of the former subject races in the history of mankind. The Bandung Conference enunciated ten principles of international conduct, including the elimination of colonialism in all its forms and manifestations, to guide them in their international relations. Since 1955, more than a score of dependent peoples have emerged as independent and sovereign states. My delegation believes that, with their distinctive experience, they have a rich contribution to make to the problems which continue to face the peoples of Asia and Africa. Old disputes persist and new frictions have arisen. The time has come, therefore, to convene a second Asian-African conference to review the conclusions and recommendations adopted by the first and to revitalize and renew its pledges which still remain unfulfilled. We have no doubt that a second conference will not fail to make a valuable contribution to world peace.

The passing of colonialism is only the first step towards the establishment of rational and mutually beneficial economic relations between the nations, essential to the well-being of the world as a whole and to the creation of a true international community. This organization, which has made a significant contribution to the liberation of peoples and nations, faces a great challenge in the economic field. The peace, prosperity, and political stability of the world cannot be assured if poverty, disease, and ignorance continue to afflict two-thirds of mankind.

The division of the world into an affluent North and an impoverished South makes for conditions of imbalance and instability. The main problem of the poor countries is not that they are poor in resources or lacking in

enterprise. Their problems arise from the fact that, during the period of colonialism, their economies were only developed to serve as adjuncts to the industry and commerce of the colonial powers. It is only in the last decade or so that, upon attaining independence, these countries have turned their attention to the fullest exploitation and development of their resources.

Industrialization is the way to the economic development of under-developed countries, to their ability to satisfy the demands of growing populations for a better way of life and even to the rationalization of agricultural and raw material production.

The task of economic development can be carried out more speedily if their efforts are supplemented by assistance which is demanded not as atonement for past economic wrongs but flowing from a realization of enlightened self-interest. The prosperity of the affluent countries themselves cannot, in the long run, be separated from the economic development of the poorer countries. The need for a common effort to raise the standard of living of the poorer nations is, of course, recognized, and I need not labour on the point.

We do not believe that a debate on the respective merits of bilateral or international aid programmes would be productive. The needs of the developing countries for capital, for equipment, and for skills are so great that programmes of aid from different sources will supplement rather than compete with each other. For this reason my government believes that the aid programmes of the United Nations are not a substitute for aid received bilaterally and that increase in the size and scope of the former, for instance, through the establishment of a United Nations capital development fund, is welcomed, both because it will contribute to the total effort and because it will widen participation in that effort.

From whatever sources it may come, the flow of capital and skill into the under-developed countries make a vital contribution to their development efforts, as it will take many years for the presently under-developed countries to reach the stage of self-sustaining growth. This aid is gratefully received, but the availability of aid should not blind us to the fact that the primary purpose and desire of the under-developed countries is to attain viable economies.

Almost all the under-developed countries are producers of raw materials or agricultural commodities, on the export of which they depend for the import of goods and services to sustain and develop their economic life. The short term fluctuations for which the markets of primary products are notorious impose heavy losses on the primary producing countries and add to the difficulties of economic planning. The problem has been made much worse by what appears to be a secular trend of a fall in the prices of raw materials and agricultural commodities in comparison with the prices

of manufactures and capital goods. In simple terms, this means that the producer in a highly industrialized country is constantly charging more for what he sells to the farmer in the under-developed country and paying the latter less and less for what he has to offer in exchange.

The problem of stabilizing the terms of trade between the industrialized countries and the producers of agricultural commodities and raw materials, therefore, calls for urgent solution. This might take the form of stabilizing the prices of raw materials and commodities, as has been done in the case of coffee, tin, rubber, and some other products; or a scheme to insure developing countries against losses from heavy falls in the prices of their export commodities. It is no less important that the manufactures of the developing countries should not be excluded from existing or potential markets by tariff walls and cartel-like arrangements.

The forthcoming conference on International Trade and Development, which will be held in Geneva next year, will, we hope, make an important contribution towards finding solutions to these problems. Its success will depend on the attitude taken by the industrialized countries in dealing with the problems of the developing countries. We would expect that their own enlightened self-interest will prevail over monopolist tendencies and pressures from groups unable to look beyond short-term advantage.

The United Nations is often criticized for its inadequacies. Pakistan has had its share of disappointment. Nevertheless, seeing the United Nations at work in the Congo and in West Irian, who would deny that this organization is a living force and an influence in the affairs of the world? There are few problems between nations which do not, in one form or another, come under the purview of the activities or interests of the United Nations. Whenever nations have sought the assistance of the organization and have given it their honest co-operation, it has been possible to find mutually satisfactory solutions. Indonesia and the Netherlands gave a striking demonstration last year of their faith in the principles of the United Nations Charter by agreeing to the peaceful settlement, with the assistance of the organization, of their protracted and bitter dispute over West Irian. That is only an example of what can be achieved when governments are willing to subordinate considerations of sovereignty and narrow self-interest to the common interest of the peaceful settlement of disputes. We note with deep distress that another source of friction has now arisen in that region, affecting three states with which Pakistan has close and friendly ties. We are confident that the statesmanship of the leaders concerned will make possible a peaceful adjustment of the situation.

There are many practical ways in which the structure of the organization can be strengthened and its capacity to act made more effective. A more efficient conduct of the work of the General Assembly, in accordance with

the suggestions made in the report of the committee set up to examine the matter, is one of the ways in which that can be done. There is need also to strengthen the capacity of the United Nations to keep the peace, and the first essential in this connection is to find ways of avoiding the sort of difficulty that has been experienced in the financing of the peace-keeping operations in the Congo and the Middle East. We are happy that the Working Group on the Examination of the Administrative and Budgetary Procedures of the United Nations has been kept in being and given the mandate of bringing about the widest possible measure of agreement among all member states on the financing of the peace-keeping operations. We sincerely hope that the Working Group will succeed in its task. There is need also that the composition of the main organs of the United Nations, and in particular the Security Council, the Economic and Social Council, and the Secretariat, should be made more representative of the present nearly universal composition of the United Nations. We cannot but regret that political considerations of an extraneous nature have so far made it impossible for the rightful representatives of China to take their place in the United Nations and thereby make the Organization a truly universal one. We hope that counsels of wisdom will prevail in the end and that considerations of a practical nature, if nothing else, will inspire a more realistic approach to this question than has been the case up to now.

The world has known, in the past, attempts by a single power to impose peace and order in the world. The ancient Persians under the Achaemenians established the first world state in history. Alexander the Great was inspired in pursuit of his world-wide conquests by the ideal of a universal human community. The writ of Rome ran through many parts of Europe, Africa, and Asia. Surviving the dark ages, the ideal of a universal community was largely realized in Europe under dual supremacy of the Pope and the Holy Roman Emperor. In the Islamic world, the Caliphate held together diverse peoples and nations for many centuries in the framework of a universal state. Then came Chenghis Khan and following him Timur, who built their world empires on the ruins of great civilizations which they destroyed. They believed and acted upon the credo that, as there is but one God in Heaven, there must be only one ruler on earth. And until recently the sun never set on regions of the earth subject to Pax Britannica.

During the last few centuries, attempts of European powers to establish world-wide or continental domination have plunged mankind into wars of unparalleled suffering and destruction. In the present historical context, the political evolution of the world is oriented towards an international world order based on the consent and co-operation of equal sovereign states.

Can this experiment succeed? Historians who contemplate the contemporary world scene as spectators of all time and all existence do not seem

to believe that it will. They look to the imposition of a world order by the unchallengeable power exercised in combination by the two super-states as the only alternative for mankind to self-destruction. In default of such a combination we are warned that in the foreseeable future a third power may well believe itself to be under the mandate of Heaven to rule the world.

Philosophies such as these are a challenge to our faith in the United Nations. The world organization was conceived as an alternative to world hegemony, to the domination of one super-power or more over all others. It is inconceivable that in the era of the United Nations sovereign states will acquiesce in an order imposed by the strength of a great power or even that the shape of the world will be decided by the contest of exclusive ideologies or ways of life. We shall do well to remind ourselves, while we are pre-occupied with short-term prospectives, of the ultimate goal towards which the United Nations must move, if mankind is to be saved from self-destruction and permitted to realize the promise of man's high destiny implicit in his advent.

Address to the Twelve Hundred and Twenty-First Plenary Meeting of the United Nations General Assembly on September 30, 1963 (Afternoon Session)

Mr. President,

The Pakistan delegation does not wish to enter into a debate of recrimination and slander. We have done our best, in our own moderate and proper fashion, to try to impress upon this audience the importance of the settlement of the dispute on Kashmir as a fundamental problem, as a problem that affects the peace and stability of Asia. It is my duty, unfortunately, to take this rostrum again to refute the distortions and allegations that have been made against the Government of Pakistan.

First of all, with your permission, I should like to deal with the question of infiltration—a matter which we consider to be a deliberate policy of eviction of Indian Muslim citizens from India into Pakistan. I would declare here before you that the question whether these people are being evicted or whether they are infiltrators can be decided by a United Nations inquiry commission, by an international inquiry commission, by a Commonwealth inquiry commission, or by any third-party commission agreed to by India and Pakistan. These are ascertainable facts. It can be ascertained by any inquiry commission whether these unfortunate, helpless people driven by the Indian bayonet into Pakistan are Indians or Pakistanis. That is a verifiable fact, an ascertainable fact. The submission of the Government of Pakistan to the Government of India has been that it should kindly stop this genocide and kindly permit its citizens, who have a right under the Indian constitution to live in peace and tranquillity on Indian soil, to determine their own future. However, these people, because they are Muslims, because the sin they have committed is to have been born with a different religion, are being deliberately driven from their homes and hearths into Pakistan.

We have again and again appealed to the Government of India to hold a ministerial conference on the subject, to hold a high-level conference on the subject, or to allow an inquiry commission to determine the future of these poor, innocent people driven out of their homes, but so far these appeals have fallen on deaf ears. The Government of India has refused to permit a solution of this human problem. These poor, unfortunate people from the States of Assam and Tripura are being driven out of India into East Pakistan, only because they happen to be born Muslims and although they are Indian citizens and under the Indian constitution have the same protection of equal rights as the other citizens of India. I repeat from this rostrum of the United Nations General Assembly that Pakistan is prepared here and now to accept an international inquiry commission into the matter, a United Nations inquiry commission into the matter, a Commonwealth inquiry commission into the matter or any other third-party commission mutually agreed upon by India and Pakistan, to investigate and determine the future of these poor, unfortunate citizens who are being driven from their homes.

We are told that this is a convenient attempt by the Government of Pakistan to reduce its own population so as to remove the disparity in population between East Pakistan and West Pakistan, in order to enable equal representation in the National Assembly of Pakistan on the basis of parity between West Pakistan and East Pakistan. That is an admission of the fact that there have been elections in Pakistan, that there is a National Assembly in Pakistan—that there have been not only one election but three elections in Pakistan as in the great state of India, for Pakistan and India became independent at precisely the same time.

I would now refer to the question of Kashmir. It has been said that the central issue in Kashmir is not that of self-determination but that of the aggression committed by Pakistan in the years 1948 and 1949. That is not a new charge. Indian charges of Pakistan's aggression were heard by the Security Council and rejected when it decided that the question of Kashmir's accession should be decided by the Kashmiris themselves. That decision was accepted by India. Can India now go back on its acceptance of the United Nations resolutions, which were adopted after a full hearing was given to India's charges? Under what notion of justice can a so-called aggression by Pakistan justify the denial to the Kashmiri people of their natural rights to determine their own future? I should like to quote some of the statements of the Prime Minister of India on the question of a plebiscite in Kashmir. The Prime Minister of India said:

> "I should like to make it clear that question of aiding Kashmir in this emergency is not designed in any way to influence the State to accede to India. Our view which we have repeatedly made public is that the ques-

tion of accession in any disputed territory or State must be decided in accordance with the wishes of people and we adhere to this view".

That was stated by Mr. Nehru on October 27, 1947.

The Prime Minister of India also said:

"We are anxious not to finalize anything in a moment of crisis and without the fullest opportunity to be given to the people of Kashmir to have their say. It is for them ultimately to decide.

"And let me make it clear that it has been our policy all along that where there is a dispute about the accession of a state to either Dominion, the accession must be made by the people of that state. It is in accordance with this policy that we have added a proviso to the Instrument of Accession of Kashmir."

That was stated by Prime Minister Nehru on November 2, 1947.

The Indian representative in the Security Council said:

"The question of the future status of Kashmir *vis-a-vis* her neighbours and the world at large, and a further question, namely, whether she should withdraw from her accession to India, and either accede to Pakistan or remain independent, with a right to claim admission as a Member of the United Nations—all this we have recognized to be a matter for unfettered decision by the people of Kashmir, after normal life is restored to them."

That was stated in the Security Council on January 15, 1948. The following was stated by the Prime Minister of India:

"... the Government of India not only reaffirms its acceptance of the principle that the question of the continuing accession of the State of Jammu and Kashmir to India shall be decided through the democratic method of a free and impartial plebiscite under the auspices of the United Nations, but is anxious that the conditions necessary for such a plebiscite should be created as quickly as possible."

That was stated by the Prime Minister of India in a letter dated September 11, 1951, addressed to the United Nations representatives. Then again the Prime Minister of India stated:

"We have declared that the fate of Kashmir is ultimately to be decided by the people. That pledge we have given not only to the people of Kashmir but to the world. We will not and cannot back out of it."

That was stated by Mr. Nehru in a broadcast to the Indian nation on November 2, 1947.

Those are the pledges given by no less a person than the Prime Minister of India to his own people, to the people of Pakistan, and to the world at large, both from his own country and in the Security Council of the United Nations. Now we are told that Pakistan has committed aggression in Kashmir. If Pakistan has committed a wrong against the people of Kashmir, let the people of Kashmir themselves decide whether it is Pakistan

that has committed any wrong against them or it is the people and Government of India which have usurped their territory and have committed vandalistic plunder against the people of Kashmir. That is for the Kashmiris themselves to decide. It is not for Pakistan or India to decide whether the Kashmiris want to accede to Pakistan or India.

Pakistan does not want Kashmir. We do not say that Kashmir should automatically become a part of Pakistan. We say that the people of Kashmir, like the people of any part of Asia or Africa, should have the right to self-determination, that they should decide their own future in a free and impartial way, in a manner which not only the people of Kashmir want but which the governments of both, India and Pakistan, have decided in the United Nations by two resolutions of the Security Council. These two resolutions of the Security Council are now being denied, firstly, on the grounds that this would mean Katangization of India, and that a pluralistic state like India would not like to see the Katangization of its country. Nor would we like to see the break-up of our neighbour. Nobody would like to see the Balkanization of a state. But this is not a question of Katanga or of the Balkanization of India. The Indian Independence Act gave the rulers of the princely states the choice to decide their own future in consultation with the wishes of the people. There is no analogy whatsoever between the Balkanization of a country and the exercise of the right of self-determination given to a people and accepted by the other states and agreed to by the Government of India here and to the world at large.

However, another reason has been advanced: that conditions have changed. The doctrine of *rebus sic stantibus* has been applied by the Government of India to the question of Kashmir. It will be recalled that the doctrine of *rebus sic stantibus,* which has no respect for agreements solemnly arrived at, which shows contempt for agreements entered into by sovereign states, has usually been advanced by aggressive states, by states like Nazi Germany, which tore up agreements on the pretext that conditions had changed.

Is it for India to be a judge of its own cause? If conditions have really changed, it has to be objectively ascertained by an impartial body. Well, let an impartial body objectively ascertain whether conditions have changed. This is not to be ascertained subjectively at any time on the whim and fancy of the Government of India, which has committed aggression against the people of Jammu and Kashmir but does not permit the people of Jammu and Kashmir to exercise the right of self-determination.

Shaikh Muhammed Abdullah, the great leader of Kashmir, languishes in gaol. For the last ten years, this great leader of the people of Kashmir has been rotting in the gaols of India. In that decade, we have seen many nations become free. A decade is a long period. To have the leader of a people in gaol for ten years is far too long. Men die, children enter into

maturity—and during that time this leader has been rotting in gaol, and the conscience of the world has not been aroused by the fact that Shaikh Muhammed Abdullah, the leader of the people of Kashmir, languishes in gaol. The world is so conscious of the voluntary imprisonment of a Cardinal in Hungary that the President of a country has to mention it. When a great leader of Algeria is in gaol for five years, the whole world is aroused. But here is the case of a great leader of the people of Jammu and Kashmir, who has been languishing in gaol for the last ten years—and not a word, not a whisper, is uttered.

The hands of India are soiled with the blood of the people of Kashmir. Let their conscience be clear on this matter. Let them release Shaikh Abdullah. Let them hold a free and impartial plebiscite.

I shall quote from the London Times on the question of Shaikh Abdullah's detention. The London Times says:

"The trial of Shaikh Abdullah, former Prime Minister of Kashmir, drags on in Jammu, and the hearing of charges of criminal conspiracy is moving more slowly than anybody could have expected—except those who believe that the Government is interested not in a conviction but in continued imprisonment for a man who if released would still be a potent force in Kashmir. The tenth anniversary of the Shaikh's first arrest was two weeks ago and he has been in gaol ever since except for four months in 1958.

"The charges of conspiracy were formulated after his rearrest in 1958 but the trial began only a year ago. Then the defence was hopefully calculating that twelve months would see the prosecution case completed, although it was known that the state would produce about 250 witnesses. In fact, the past year has seen only a tenth of that number of witnesses completing their evidence.

"At the beginning of this year, speaking for himself and his colleagues in the dock (there are 24 accused persons), the Shaikh protested against the 'unconscionable prolongation' of the trial. He said that he believed the state had spent about £ 2,600,000 on the case and that he was unable to meet the mounting costs of defence.

"In June, the senior prosecuting counsel, Mr. N. S. Pande"—not the defence counsel, but the senior prosecuting counsel—"retired from the case. He said that the money for his fees could be better used. The trial, he said, could go on for another five to seven years."

All we ask for in Kashmir is that India honour its pledge. India should stand by its pledge, and no pretext should be advanced to interfere with a humanitarian outcome of this dispute. The people of Kashmir, like the people of the rest of Asia and Africa, should be permitted to decide their own future according to their own free will.

Whether Pakistan should withdraw its troops, and how many of its troops should be withdrawn, is all that we are willing to submit to any third-party inquiry set up to determine what Pakistan should do and what India should do. In the last fifteen years, we have agreed to all fourteen proposals that have been advanced for the settlement of the Kashmir dispute, and India has rejected all of them.

It has been said that India exercises sovereignty over the State of Jammu and Kashmir, and that this sovereignty is total and complete. It is so total and complete that we had six rounds of negotiations with the Government of India, in which I participated, on the future of the State of Jammu and Kashmir. This is a disputed territory, and it will always remain a disputed territory until justice is done to the people of Kashmir. We shall never agree to a solution which is based on expediency and on brute force. Justice is bound to be done to the people of Kashmir ultimately.

Reference has also been made to India's conflict with China and our concern over this conflict. We are concerned over this conflict, because it affects two states which are our neighbours. We are also affected by it because, as a result of this boundary conflict, India has tried to magnify the whole conflict so as to receive gratuitous armed assistance from the Western powers. In the last fifteen years, India's policies, even from this rostrum, have always been directed against Western powers. India has always tried to undermine the interests of the West. And now, all of a sudden, we are accused of a metamorphosis—when they themselves are guilty of the most grotesque form of metamorphosis. In fifteen years, from this rostrum and other platforms, India has time and again accused and indicated the West for its policies—and today it says that Pakistan has shifted its policies. What shift in its policies has Pakistan brought about? We are still members of the two defence alliances; we still adhere to them. It is India that wants the best of both worlds.

The world has been too kind to India. Time will show that India's inconsistent policies are bound to come to a dead end, because India cannot continue this policy of duplicity indefinitely. We are members of the defence alliances, and we have obligations under the defence alliances from which we have not withdrawn. India, however, claims still to be a non-aligned country, whereas in fact we know that, as a result of the assistance that it is receiving, its policies are being directed and geared in certain ways—for a certain period of time—which are beneficial to the Government of India.

We have been accused of taking advantage of the Sino-Indian conflict. I would ask the Assembly: What advantage has Pakistan taken of that conflict? When the unfortunate conflict broke out and when the Indian armies were on the run and on the run in such a humiliating fashion—Pakistan could well have taken advantage of the situation. But it was

Pakistan that restrained itself; it was Pakistan that exercised remarkable restraint and took no action at all. I doubt if any other state in that situation would have restrained itself as Pakistan did at that time. And yet this has not been appreciated. We have been told that we are taking advantage of the situation. As I have said, we could have taken advantage of the situation, but we did not, because we believe in the peaceful method, in the peaceful solution of international disputes, and not in solutions based on armed conflict.

In the last fifteen years, India has committed aggression no less than five times. That is an enviable record: in the last fifteen years, I repeat, India has committed aggression five times to settle its international problems. Yet today Pakistan has been called an aggressor. This is most ironic.

We have been accused of having some sort of extraordinary relations with the People's Republic of China. The People's Republic of China is a neighbour of Pakistan. We have a boundary of some 400 miles with the People's Republic of China. We desire good relations with all our neighbours. Is that wrong? Is that a crime? Is it wrong for Pakistan to want to have friendly and harmonious relations with all its neighbours, in the interest of peace in Asia and in the interest of peace in the world? We have good neighbourly relations with Nepal. We have good neighbourly relations with Ceylon. We have good neighbourly relations with Burma. We have resumed relations with Afghanistan. We would like to have good neighbourly relations with India as well, if India were willing to base its policies on the dictates of justice and equity and were not prone to commit aggression against Pakistan, which it has repeatedly called its "Enemy No. 1". The former Defence Minister of India and other responsible people in India, including statesmen, have referred to Pakistan as "India's Enemy No. 1"—but last October India came into a clash with the People's Republic of China, and not with Pakistan.

What has been so extraordinary about Pakistan's relations with the People's Republic of China? We have signed a boundary agreement with the People's Republic of China because we have a boundary with the People's Republic of China. If we had a boundary with Nigeria or with Guatemala, we would sign an agreement with Nigeria or Guatemala. But it so happens that the People's Republic of China has a 400-mile boundary with Pakistan. We signed this agreement as an agreement between two equal sovereign states, in a spirit of compromise and adjustment. But these are not the methods to which India subscribes. India wants things on a take-it-or-leave-it basis. That is why India cannot come to any agreement with any of its neighbours. That is why India wants Pakistan to vacate its illusory aggression. That is why India wants the People's Republic of China to vacate its illusory aggression.

We have very generously been offered a "no-war pact" with India. Now, much has been made of this no-war pact offer to Pakistan. It has just been offered again, I believe. Recently, during his visit to the United States, the President of India proposed that a no-war pact be signed between Pakistan and India and be registered with the United Nations. It is assumed that its registration in the United Nations would give the pact international validity in law and in morality.

May we ask the Government of India this question: What sanctity has been attached by India to the United Nations resolutions on Jammu and Kashmir to which India is a party? The respect shown by the Government of India for the United Nations resolutions on Jammu and Kashmir makes us highly skeptical about that assurance.

Pakistan is a member of the United Nations, and, as a member of the international organization, we are enjoined by the Charter of the United Nations to resolve international disputes by peaceful means. Article 2, paragraphs 3 and 4 of the United Nations Charter are quite clear. Article 2, paragraph 3 states:

> "All Members shall settle their international disputes by peaceful means in such a manner that international peace and security, and justice, are not endangered".

Article 2, paragraph 4 states:

> "All Members shall refrain in their international relations from the threat or use of force against the territorial integrity or political independence of any State, or in any other manner inconsistent with the purposes of the United Nations".

These provisions of the Charter place an obligation on Pakistan and on all other members of the United Nations to settle their international disputes by peaceful means. Are these not, in effect, a no-war declaration? As a member of the United Nations for the last fifteen years, and having resolutely carried out in letter and in spirit the resolutions of the United Nations, and believing that the Government of India also, as a member of the United Nations, is enjoined by this very Charter to settle all disputes by peaceful means, we wonder why, instead of discharging our obligations by deed, we should only repeat in words what we have already so solemnly affirmed between ourselves and before the world organization.

On the eve of the final round of talks, when it was clear that the chances of success were remote, and after making it difficult for the problem to be settled by peaceful means on the basis of honour and equity, India proposed a no-war pact, which in reality meant that Pakistan should accept the cease-fire line as a permanent division of Kashmir. If we were to have agreed to a no-war pact, it would have meant that Pakistan agreed to accept the *status quo*. Such a settlement can never be described as honourable and equitable.

I repeat: Pakistan will not resort to armed conflict at this time or at any time. But we cannot sign on the dotted line on India's dictation.

We are one-third the size of India in every respect—in terms of population and territory, in terms of armed forces, manpower and economic strength. In all respects we are one-third the size of India. Pakistan would never embark on aggression against India, not only because we are a smaller country, but also because it is a cardinal principle of our foreign policy to settle all disputes by peaceful means and through negotiations, in accordance with the principles of the United Nations Charter.

From our point of view, it would be repugnant to our interests, to our higher principles, to the welfare of our people and to peace and stability in the sub-continent and Asia, to embark on aggression to resolve the Kashmir dispute. We have never taken such action. We were not even tempted to resort to a show of force during India's greatest hour of humiliation and defeat last winter. This is a sufficient demonstration of Pakistan's peaceful intentions. I think that very few countries would have restrained themselves as Pakistan did when India faced this disaster on its frontiers against the People's Republic of China. There can be no better demonstration of Pakistan's peaceful intentions in words and in deeds than the conduct of Pakistan in the last fifteen years.

What, on the other hand, has been the conduct of India? What has been the attitude of India in the settlement of its disputes? India has the rare privilege of being the only modern state which in fifteen years has resorted no less than five times to armed force to settle its international problems.

In this respect, let us consider the statements of the leaders of India. I hope that the Assembly will bear with me when I repeat what has been stated by Indian leaders on the method of settling the Kashmir problem.

The Prime Minister of India said, on January 21, 1962:

"So far as China and Pakistan are concerned, India is determined to vacate their aggression".

The former Defence Minister of India, Mr. Krishna Menon stated:

"You are aware that we have not abjured violence in regard to any country who violates our interests".

The Congress President, Mr. Sanjiva Reddy, said:

"We have to liberate the occupied areas in Kashmir. We are postponing the issue, but we do not accept the cease-fire line as a permanent solution".

He expected the people in occupied Kashmir to struggle to rid themselves of the usurper and said that:

"within a short period of time the Government of India will choose the correct time to liberate that part of Kashmir which is under Pakistan's control".

These are the remarks of those Indian leaders who have offered Pakistan a no-war pact.

We have good relations with all countries, with all the countries in our region. We have tried to resolve our differences by peaceful means with all our neighbours, with all countries with whom we have had differences. Pakistan will continue to promote peace in our region and peace in the world. We shall not resort to force. We shall live not only by our words but we shall show that our words can be demonstrated in action. It is for the Indian government to adopt similar policies so that we can live in peace.

Our people live in poverty. We want to wipe out the stigma and the vice of poverty. We would like to see co-operation and good-will between the people of India and the people of Pakistan so that we could harness our resources for the good of our people in the sub-continent, and for the good of people in Asia so that we can march forward towards a better order.

It is not the law of God that only the people of Asia and Africa shall live in poverty. Let us co-operate and let us bring about the best of our talents in order to eradicate the stigma of poverty, but this can only be done if there is justice in the world, if people are willing to accept the principles of equality, if they are willing to settle their disputes by peaceful means. It is of no avail to try to cast any doubts in the minds of our friends. We are steadfast friends. We have remained steadfast friends with those with whom we have had friendship, and over the last fifteen years Pakistan has demonstrated that it lives by its words and its deeds.

I pledge here, on behalf of the 100 million people of Pakistan, that the right of self-determination, which is a right which India has agreed to give to the people of Kashmir, will be achieved, and that the people of Kashmir will become the recipients of justice, because that is the law of equity and that is the law of fraternity.

First Address to the Twelve Hundred and Thirty-Ninth Plenary Meeting of the United Nations General Assembly on October 11, 1963 (Afternoon Session)

The representative of India has stated:

> "What grieves us most deeply in this context is the recent tendency of the unprincipled behaviour of making friends of erstwhile enemies and of seeking strange alliances for collusion in aggression."

I am constrained to exercise my right of reply because there can be no doubt of the representative of India's aspersions against my country. May I ask, was China an erstwhile enemy of Pakistan with whom Pakistan has now become friends? If so, I should like the representative of India to produce evidence of Pakistan's enmity with China.

Since the emergence of the People's Republic of China towards the end of 1949, Pakistan has had a correct and friendly relation with that country. We recognized the People's Republic of China in 1950, about the same time as India did, and also the United Kingdom. We voted for the admission of the People's Republic of China to the United Nations in 1950 and in the following years. We became a member of the Manila Treaty—better known as SEATO—in 1954, but, as this was purely a defensive treaty against aggression, our relations with the People's Republic of China continued in their normal course.

In 1956 Prime Minister Chou En-Lai visited Pakistan at the invitation of the Government of Pakistan, and his visit was returned by the Prime Minister of Pakistan as a reciprocal gesture of courtesy and goodwill. In December, 1960, two years before the outbreak of the Sino-Indian conflict last October, Pakistan proposed a demarcation of the common border between China's province of Sinkiang and the contiguous areas the defence of which is the responsibility of Pakistan. The People's Republic of China

gave a favourable indication of its willingness to negotiate a boundary agreement. The preliminary formalities were completed in May, 1962, and the negotiations themselves commenced in Peking before China and India clashed in the NEFA and the Ladakh frontiers.

Does this record of Pakistan's relations with China establish that the two countries were enemies who became friends only after the outbreak of the Sino-Indian conflict last year?

The representative of India, in the same passage, has accused Pakistan, by insinuation, of "seeking strange alliances for collusion in aggression". May I ask the representative of India to produce evidence of these "strange alliances"? Was she referring perchance to the boundary agreement completed last year or to the trade and air agreement? What evidence is there in India's possession of this "collusion in aggression"? I have already said that we have entered into no such collusion; if we had, we would have taken advantage of the opportunity to attack India last October when India was engaged in a conflict with China. We did not do so; and yet India, instead of appreciating the peaceful conduct and good neighbourly intentions of Pakistan, has accused Pakistan of "collusion in aggression".

It is clear from the allegation of the representative of India that in its pursuit of domination and hegemony of the Indian Ocean region, India cannot contemplate with equanimity the existence of small independent states on its borders and will not permit them the right to conduct their own affairs internally and externally. Only a few years ago, when the cry of Chini-Hindi Bhai Bhai, which means "China-India, brothers together" was resounding from one corner of India to the other, Pakistan was accused of not being friendly to India's brother, the People's Republic of China, and of aligning itself as a member of SEATO against China.

Today, when the relationship between India and China has become unfraternal, Pakistan is accused of having changed its feelings of enmity towards China to those of friendship. This kind of self-reversal is psychologically interesting. It indicates, I fear, a paranoid state. Otherwise, why should India expect its neighbouring countries to regulate their own relationships with third countries according to the twists and turns of India's own relations with them? The fact is that India cannot bring itself to recognize that its neighbours have the right, as equal sovereign states, to make independent judgements and conduct their foreign relations with other countries in the light of their own interests and in the interests of international peace and security. Is this not a covert claim to suzerainty of India over its smaller neighbours and the manifestation of neo-colonialism in its most insidious form?

The representative of India went on to state: "It is noteworthy that such collusion extends to the point where one of the parties describes the naked

aggression committed by the other as "illusory" as was done in this Assembly only a few days ago."

Obviously, the representative of India is referring to my reply to her allegations before this Assembly on September 30. Aggression, as this Assembly is aware, is both a matter of law and a matter of fact. What is the principle of international law that was transgressed in the outbreak of fighting between India and China last October? Is the MacMahon Line a legal line? It is so claimed by the Government of India. It is denied by the People's Republic of China.

It may also be noted that the legality of the MacMahon Line was also denied by its predecessor government, the Republic of China.

Have the Colombo Powers, which have been exercising their good offices to bring about a peaceful adjustment of the situation between India and China, given their verdict on this Indian charge of aggression against China? To the best of our knowledge the judgement, the fact of who committed aggression last October has yet to be established. Surely, India's own word cannot be the final verdict even though India believes that it can do no wrong.

The representative of India also said, with all the authority of her government, that she would like to deny categorically my assertion that the central issue in Kashmir is that of self-determination. Let me remind her of the statement of the Prime Minister of India, made on November 25, 1947, in the Indian Constituent Assembly: "The issue in Kashmir is whether violence and naked force shall decide the future or the will of the people."

Does the representative of India deny the statement? The representative of India also referred to the genesis of the Kashmir dispute and alleged that Pakistan is embarrassed by facts relating to its origin. She mentioned the acts of "plunder, arson, rape, and murder" alleged to have been committed by the tribesmen who entered Kashmir through Pakistan territory. But she passed over in complete silence the acts of plunder, arson, rape, and murder committed by the feudal tyrant, the Maharajah of Kashmir, and multiplied a thousand-fold in his campaign of genocide against his own people—the same tyrant from whom India claims to derive sovereignty over Kashmir. Let me cite the report of the London Times of October 10, 1947, that "237,000 Muslims were systematically exterminated, unless they escaped to Pakistan, by the Dogra forces, headed by the Maharajah in person."

The representative of India gave her own version of the United Nations Commission's resolutions on Kashmir, according to which she tried to fasten on Pakistan the obligation to effect an unconditional and unilateral withdrawal of its military forces from Kashmir. But the essence of these resolutions is that the obligations of withdrawal of forces by the two

sides are reciprocal and that the withdrawals should be concurrent. Moreover, these withdrawals had to be governed by the Truce Agreement between the parties. It is India which has consistently refused to co-operate in the formulation of this agreement and the modalities of its implementation. Then it turns around and accuses Pakistan of failure to comply with the United Nations Commission's resolutions.

The representative of India maintains that India's sovereignty over Kashmir is complete and total and cannot be questioned. Not so long ago, we used to hear in these very halls similar reiterations of the unquestionable sovereignty of France over Algeria, and we continue to hear them from Portugal. These "unquestionable" claims have not only been questioned but unsettled by the irrepressible force of the principle of self-determination enunciated by the Charter.

But we find from the statement of the representative of India that India has, as it were, procured proof of its claim to sovereignty from the fact of its involvement with China in Ladakh. I confess that it is hard for me to comment on a statement of this kind because the only inference to which it can lead is that India chose to provoke China into conflict so that it might thereby consolidate its title over Kashmir. Then the Indian representative opposes self-determination in the following terms: "It does not, however, apply to the present case, since it is not applicable to a section of a people. It applies to all those territories where, by force of arms or by the vicissitudes of history people are held under an alien power. If the policy of self-determination were to apply to parts of constitutionally created states most of them would be broken up. The plea of self-determination in a plural society could mean nothing but disruption. And may I add that most of the new states in Asia and Africa fall into this category. That is why, I venture to suggest, the United Nations tried so hard to prevent the secession of Katanga on the plea of self-determination."

The representatives will note the attempt made here to denounce self-determination by trying to relate it to the question of Katanga's secession. The Katanga question had nothing to do with self-determination. In fact, the secession of Katanga was aimed at the destruction of the self-determination of the Congolese people. Had Mr. Tshombe consulted the wishes of the population of Katanga, is there any doubt that the majority of the different tribes inhabiting that province would have voted against secession? What he did in fact was to substitute his own arbitrary will, as the Maharajah of Kashmir did, for the people's right of self-determination. We trust that the representative of India will refrain from attempting to establish similarities where none exist.

In regard to the contention that the right of self-determination is not applicable to a section of the people and that if applied to parts of constitu-

tionally created states most of them would be broken up, let me remind the representative of India that the people of Kashmir are not a section of the people of India. Nor is Kashmir a part of the constitutionally created state of India. Let me remind the representative of India of the statement of the Prime Minister of India made in the Indian Parliament on March 31, 1955: "Kashmir, while a problem between India and Pakistan, is not a thing to be bandied about between India and Pakistan for it has a soul of its own and an individuality of its own."

Let me remind the representative of India also of his statement of January 2, 1952: "Kashmir belongs to the Kashmiri people. If they tell us to walk out, I would have no hesitation in quitting Kashmir."

The so-called argument about India being a plural society which should not be disrupted by the application of the principle of self-determination, if logically followed, would give a new lease on life to imperialistic establishments. It would mean that empires should never be dissolved. Then the representative of India referred to the "two-nation" theory on the basis of which British India was partitioned into India and Pakistan. This was never a theory. It was also a fact embedded in the history of the sub-continent for a thousand years and its logical consequence—namely, the Hindus and Muslims are entitled to separate sovereignties in their respective majority areas—was accepted as much by India as by Pakistan.

It did not mean any division of classes of citizenship between Hindus and Moslems either in India or in Pakistan. By bringing it into controversy the Indian leaders are only trying to question the principle of the establishment of Pakistan, thus making it impossible for relations between the two countries ever to be stabilized. This notwithstanding, we welcome the pronouncement of the representative of India in seeking the friendship and co-operation of my country. Pakistan has always demonstrated its sincere willingness to be a partner in the peaceful pursuit of a more prosperous and happier sub-continent. As I said on September 30, it is not the law of nature for our people to live in perpetual poverty. We are willing to share our talents and resources for a better life for our people, for the people of India and the people of Pakistan. What a great and glorious vista can be opened up only when India vacates its aggression in Kashmir and permits the unfortunate people of that strife-ridden region to share and participate in the mutual benefits as a people who have determined their destiny.

Pakistan has sedulously striven by peaceful means to achieve this honourable end. Unfortunately, India persists in holding the people of Kashmir in bondage. Let the chains of incarceration break, free the Kashmiris and have the friendship and goodwill of Pakistan. In so doing, India would be the greater for it. It would have then truly contributed to a peaceful order in the sub-continent.

Pakistan is one-third the size of India. We would, therefore, welcome from every consideration the complete amelioration of tension and bitterness between us. It has always been Pakistan's effort to establish cordial relations with our neighbours, but in establishing this relationship it is wiser to break the barrier of injustice and aggression that divides us in Kashmir and which India has erected in defiance of the United Nations resolutions and its own solemn pledges.

Co-operation does not flow from words. It is rooted in conduct and in positive action. Let India's words be matched by its actions. Neither India nor the world will find Pakistan faltering in its fullest response to a positive gesture recognizing the norms of justice and equity in the world.

Second Address to the Twelve Hundred and Thirty-Ninth Plenary Meeting of the United Nations General Assembly on October 11, 1963 (Afternoon Session)

It is rather astonishing that the representative of the Government of India should question the right of the delegation of Pakistan to exercise its right of reply. The representative of India opened her statement by saying that the Pakistan delegation did not have this inherent right which is recognized in the Charter, in the rules of procedure, and in the practices of the United Nations. This is the inherent right of every member, and it is a duty which every country owes to its people.

In my general policy statement of September 30 my references to the fundamental dispute and to the question of the deportation of Muslims from the States of Assam and Tripura were brief and, objectively speaking, unprovocative. Kashmir is a matter of fundamental importance to Pakistan. It is the great divider between India and Pakistan. Therefore it was my duty to make reference to that dispute, if disputes are to be settled between states in a peaceful manner and in accordance with the norms of international law and the Charter of the United Nations. It was the leader of the Indian delegation that chose to enter into a battle of words, into polemics, and made various references to Kashmir and to other matters and also touched upon questions which are entirely within the domestic jurisdiction of Pakistan. Therefore it was again my duty to my country and my duty to this body and to the world at large to place the facts—the true facts—on record. The representative of India this afternoon has questioned my right to do so. Herein lies the attitude of the Government of India on disputes and matters that concern it. When it comes to the disputes of other states, India always takes the role of a preacher and admonishes countries that have disputes and tells them how to settle their disputes; but when a dispute

affects India it refuses the right to a country that is also a party to the dispute even to mention the dispute or to exercise the right of reply. This is the attitude which unfortunately persists and it does not permit a settlement on the basis of negotiation, on the basis of understanding, and on the basis of mutual accommodation.

So great is India's tradition of interfering in the affairs of other countries that this evening the representative of India said that the Hindu population of Pakistan should have increased by two-and-one-quarter per cent and the fact that this population had not increased by two-and-one-quarter per cent was something equally surprising. The Indian government would now like to tell other states how their populations should increase within a given period of time and it wants to interfere in the exercise of the conjugal rights of citizens of another country. I think this shows the Indian Government's attitude in interfering in such fundamental issues which are entirely within the domestic jurisdiction of another country. We have 10 million Hindus living in East Pakistan and about a million or so living in West Pakistan. Now we have heard the Government of India tell us that that population is not large enough and should increase by two-and-one-quarter per cent. In acquiescence to the demand of the representative of India, I shall convey this demand of the Government of India to my authorities and we shall try to oblige it in this and any other way in order to bring about mutual accommodation based on a common understanding between states.

The representative of India today and on September 30 made references also to the system of government that exists in Pakistan and contrasted it with the system of government in India. The representative of India referred to India as a democracy and said that in Pakistan democracy does not exist and that, because democracy does not exist in Pakistan, the people of Kashmir should have no right to self-determination. That is weird logic which we cannot understand. As far as democracy in India is concerned, I am not going to go into that matter in detail, for it is not my concern what form or system of government exists in India. Nor am I going to quote any of the Indian leaders on whether or not democracy exists in India or on whether there is only a form of democracy and in substance a dictatorship there. I will not refer to the patina of evidence in that respect. I will only mention what the President of the Republic of India said on October 1, 1963, as was reported in The New York Times. The President of the Republic of India, that great philosopher, said:

> "What we have in India today is not real democracy but only a phoney democracy. If we were real democrats—which, I may say, we are not—there would not be so much discontent and ill-will".

That statement was made by the Head of State of India only a few days ago on the brand of democracy that exists in India.

Then we are told that I protested from this rostrum against the incarceration of that great Kashmiri leader, Sheikh Mohammed Abdullah. To justify the imprisonment of Sheikh Abdullah the representative of India said that at one stage or other Pakistan called Sheikh Abdullah a quisling. The question here is not what Pakistan at one stage or other called Sheikh Abdullah. Is Sheikh Abdullah in prison because we called him a quisling? This is a very interesting situation. Sheikh Mohammed Abdullah, the great leader of the people of Kashmir, has been rotting in gaol for the past ten years. It is true that he is having a trial—a trial after a fashion. Here, again, the Indians excel in forms. Both of us have learnt something or other from the British, and in this matter I think the Indians have surpassed us: to maintain the forms of democracy but in substance to have a dictatorship and to have arbitrary authority. Sheikh Mohammed Abdullah is undergoing trial, we are told—a trial that has been going on for ten years. In ten years, out of 3,000 witnesses, only 30 witnesses have been examined. It must be a complicated trial, and obviously it will take time for the proceedings to end, but when the proceedings will end is something that neither you nor I can contemplate, for the patience of the Indian people is well known in history. This trial will go on indefinitely. Sheikh Abdullah will receive justice, because so far 30 witnesses have given evidence in a trial where 3,000 witnesses are involved.

I refer to this unjust incarceration of Sheikh Mohammed Abdullah, not because we wish to interfere in the internal affairs of India; I refer to it because Sheikh Mohammed Abdullah is not an Indian citizen. His nationality has yet to be determined. Therefore I have a right to refer to the imprisonment of Sheikh Mohammed Abdullah. However, the Indian representative, again with a logic which the Indians can best understand, has referred, by way of defence or by way of an answer, to the imprisonment of a Pakistani national, Khan Abdul Ghaffar Khan. As the latter is a Pakistani national, this is a matter which is entirely within the domestic jurisdiction of Pakistan, and India has no right to make reference to his imprisonment. Khan Abdul Ghaffar Khan's brother was a Chief Minister of our province recently—right up to 1955. It is not that he has something inherently wrong with him. Khan Abdul Ghaffar Khan was against the two-nation theory. He was against the establishment of Pakistan. India has no right to refer to the imprisonment of a man who is not a national of the Indian Government and who does not come from a disputed territory.

Again distortion reached its climax and apogee when we were told a few moments ago that I said that we had held the MacMahon Line in dispute. One can imagine the justice and the fairness with which India analyses the situation, because I had hardly left the rostrum when this utter distortion took place. I did not say anything of the kind. I said that the Indian Govern-

ment claims the MacMahon Line to be the dividing line between India and China and that this is denied by the People's Republic of China. I said that the dispute arose because the Government of India recognizes it as the legal dividing line between India and China and the People's Republic of China does not recognize it. How did I establish in any way that Pakistan has pronounced its opinion on the MacMahon Line?

We were told that India made no reference whatsoever to Kashmir, and as India had made no reference to Kashmir, then it was our bounden duty also to make no reference to Kashmir. It is very convenient for India not to make reference to Kashmir. It is obvious why India would not like to make any reference to Kashmir. It is because India has grabbed Kashmir, because India has been holding Kashmir in bondage, and because India does not want the world to know the facts about Kashmir. India wants no light to be thrown on this ugly problem, whereas it is our duty, a duty that we owe to our people and to the people of Kashmir, to mention the Kashmir problem.

If the people of Kashmir had exercised their right of self-determination and if the matter had been settled, I too would have made no reference to Kashmir. So India has not shown any magnanimity in not making reference to Kashmir. It is understandable why India would not make any reference to Kashmir.

And then we are told that instead of responding to a gesture, we have talked about it and have entered into a dialogue on the subject. Here again today another very invidious accusation was made against Pakistan. It was said, and I quote again—"What grieves us most deeply in this context is the recent tendency of unprincipled behaviour, of making friends of erstwhile enemies and of seeking strange alliances for collusion and aggression". We are accused here of unprincipled behaviour, of making friends of erstwhile enemies and of seeking strange alliances for collusion and aggression.

These are very serious charges. These are charges which have to be refuted. The representative of India has accused Pakistan of unprincipled behaviour, of making friends with erstwhile enemies and of seeking strange alliances for collusion and aggression, and has said that the Foreign Minister of Pakistan, representing his country, has no right to exercise his right of reply.

Now I ask you, Mr. President, if this is to be the conduct of India, if these are the edicts with which the world has to comply, then I am afraid that justice will never truly be achieved.

Other consequences were also embodied in the statement. It must not be forgotten that the Sino-Indian conflict took place on the Ladakh front. Ladakh is a part of Kashmir. There are three sub-divisions of Ladakh: Skardu, Kargil, and Ladakh—and fighting took place in Ladakh. Ladakh

is a part of Kashmir and Kashmir is a territory held in dispute. With all the consequences flowing out of these sinister charges, we are none the less told by the representative of India that we have no right to exercise our right of reply.

It is not only a question of the exercise of their right of self-determination to which India is a party and has pledged its word, it is not only a question of denying the people of Kashmir their inherent right, but the tragedy has become all the more painful because these poor Kashmiris who have nothing whatsoever to do with the disputes of the giants that are involved in a clash of today became the battlefield of India's clash with China. If the poor people of Kashmir had been allowed to exercise their right of self-determination and if they had determined their destiny by now, they would not be involved in that clash which does not really concern them today, because the Kashmiris are not truly a part of India. They have been made into guinea pigs, because India is waging its war and conflict with the Chinese in Ladakh, which is a part of Kashmir. These peaceful people, who have always known peace and tranquillity in their land, have today become the guinea pigs of a conflict which does not concern them in any way. If they had exercised their right of self-determination and had chosen to be a part of Pakistan, they would have lived as peacefully in Pakistan as the rest of the people of Pakistan.

So this adds painfully to the tragedy that is taking place. In this clash of two great giants, this tiny little spot, this beautiful vale of Kashmir has been unnecessarily involved.

We have also been told that the doctrine of *rebus sic stantibus* applies to treaties but not to commitments. Now a treaty is also a commitment. It is the commitment of a state. If we are told that the resolutions of the United Nations can be flouted, that the resolutions of the Security Council and of the General Assembly can be flouted because there is a difference between a treaty and a commitment, this shows grotesque and flagrant contempt for the Charter of the United Nations. It was recently said that Charter or no Charter, when India embarks on its aggression, then whether there is international law or not it is nobody's concern and the world must take what India wants, and there is no international law in that event. It is a terrifying statement that *rebus sic stantibus* means that you can break your word in the United Nations with respect to resolutions of the General Assembly and the Security Council, but that perhaps you cannot break your word with respect to treaties.

So today we have been told that as far as the United Nations is concerned, whether it is the General Assembly or the Security Council, upon which rests the primary responsibility for the maintenance of international peace and security, commitments made by states do not have to be honoured.

How then are we to proceed if the United Nations is no longer a forum for adjudication and settlement of disputes? Commitments are made in the United Nations and confirmed and reiterated by the Prime Minister of a country, and a few years later we are told that these commitments are not honourable commitments and are therefore not pledges which have to be honoured. But with respect to treaties perhaps it is a different story.

This places the world in a great state of confusion. This shows an utter lack of respect for the United Nations. This shows that all our efforts to build a better peace through the peaceful role of the United Nations is null and void. This is a matter which causes us grave concern.

It has also been said that Pakistan has not implemented the resolutions of the United Nations. Here we have time and again said that a third party should determine who has and who has not implemented the resolutions. We are still anxious to settle through the United Nations this unfortunate dispute that divides the two countries, or through any other acceptable principle of international law. Is this an unreasonable stand? If we are charged by India with not complying with the resolutions, we say let the United Nations or let an impartial international body determine whether or not we have complied with the resolutions. It is India that does not comply with the resolutions and then charges Pakistan with not complying with the resolutions. Why should we not want to comply with the resolutions? We want to see an end to this problem and dispute, because we want to live in peace with them. We are a small country and India is a large country which has ambitions from the Hindu Kush to the Mekong River. But we are a small country and would like to live in peace with them. We would not like to have a dispute with them. But justice must be done in order to live in peace with them, and peace can only come through respect for international law and adherence to international obligations and commitments, and not by the dictates of a great power against a small power. The world would be menaced if the great powers or the semi-great powers were to dictate to the small powers. We resent the dictation of the great powers—all of us resent it—and why should Pakistan be an exception in this case? We equally resent this dictation. We do not expect India to determine whether or not we have complied with the resolutions—let the United Nations decide or let an impartial third party decide whether or not Pakistan has complied with them.

Again I make this offer here: let us break the impasse. It is not beyond the scope of ingenuity or the efforts of men to find an honourable and equitable solution of this problem. We were told, as far as Tripura is concerned, that an exodus is taking place there, that Pakistan has been avoiding a settlement of the problem, and that at the bilateral negotiations on behalf of Pakistan, conducted by me over there, we refused to accept a settlement of

this issue. This also, with due respect, I would say is not the correct position. At those bilateral negotiations we submitted that as Kashmir was the fundamental problem, efforts should be made first to settle Kashmir and then the other issues, because Kashmir is the root of all evil and if that problem were to be settled, then all these symptoms would almost automatically subside. This is not an unreasonable submission. But when we found that the intransigence was as complete as it had been in the past we said: since we cannot make progress on this matter, let us go to the other question and have it at a ministerial level. But again the Government of India refused to have it at the ministerial level, but to have it considered by other officials. But if it is left to the officials, we know what happens; the question drags on *ad infinitum*.

On September 30 I said that Pakistan was willing to accept the adjudication of the United Nations or of an international commission, even a commission composed of Commonwealth countries or any other third-party countries acceptable to both India and Pakistan. On behalf of my government, I again renew that offer, that the question of Tripura can be settled in this fashion because this is the only proper and correct fashion in which it could be settled. We are disappointed and aggrieved that all our efforts to bring about a settlement with our great neighbour have so far been refused by India.

We have accepted every proposal that has been made so far for the settlement of the problem of Kashmir and the other questions. But India does not seek to settle them because India wants to continue its hold and its oppression of Kashmir.

We are told of collusion with China. What collusion? When India was in conflict with China and had to withdraw the bulk of its armed forces for the first time for the Chinese front, Pakistan did nothing at all, did not lift a finger, did not move a single soldier, did not fire a single bullet. And yet we are told of collusion with China against India. If these gestures of goodwill and neighbourliness are to be flouted and not appreciated, where can Pakistan go? What alternative have we got?

In the last decade or so Pakistan has stood for the peaceful settlement of all disputes. We have seen former colonies become independent. In our own small way we have contributed to the efforts to decolonize them. We stand for decolonization. For Morocco, Tunisia, and Algeria it was Pakistan that made every effort to see that there should be justice and decolonization. In the case of Algeria, Pakistan offered recognition at a time when India had not. And the reasons were obvious—because of the Kashmir dispute and because of India's stake in the Security Council where France is a permanent member. France, of course, has always supported the right of self-determination, and for this we are grateful, and we are grateful that that

great country and its leader did not change that stand when we accorded recognition to Algeria, even risking perhaps a turn of events. But India did not accord recognition to Algeria because India thought that such a move might have some repercussions in the Security Council.

Pakistan has tried in every way to enhance international peace and security. We have welcomed all countries which have come here and become members of the United Nations through the exercise of the right of self-determination. This is our contribution to the exercise of the right of self-determination for other countries. How can we not be concerned with the right of self-determination?

The people of Kashmir are our blood and therefore we will struggle for this right, and this right is bound to be achieved because it is a right which cannot be denied to the people of Kashmir. Some voices may be silent today on this issue but we know that international opinion will spread concerning this matter and that it will become the concern of the world because it is a grave issue which divides two great powers and holds the people of Kashmir in bondage.

Address to the Nineteenth Session of the United Nations General Assembly on January 22, 1965

Mr. President,

On behalf of the delegation of Pakistan, I take pleasure in extending to you our most sincere congratulations on your election to the high office of the President of this Assembly. Having had the pleasure of knowing you personally for many years, may I also add my personal greetings. I am confident that your conduct of the deliberations of the Assembly will add to your reputation and further enhance the good name of your country with which Pakistan enjoys relations of increasing friendliness and co-operation.

It is all too evident that we are passing through a time of severe test for the United Nations, for its efficacy and, indeed, its very existence. The constitutional crisis that has overtaken us has its roots in different conceptions of the role of the United Nations in the minds of the great powers. We all have our ideas on the ideal solution for this crisis. If I do not choose to articulate mine at this stage, it is for the sole reason that the issue is the subject of delicate negotiations at present and I have no wish to try to muddy the waters still more. At the moment, it might not be an excessive hope that the immediate issue of the normalization of the Assembly's proceedings will soon be resolved. But that, of course, will not be the final resolution of the crisis; the deeper problem of the harmonization of our views regarding the functions of the United Nations and its two main organs, the General Assembly and the Security Council, will remain.

I am confident that the Asian, African, and Latin American countries, which have an enormous stake in the existence and vitality of the United Nations, will play a decisive role in that final resolution. They have demonstrated their deep concern and it has, I believe, become apparent that no solution of the problem will be viable unless it has the wholehearted support

of the smaller powers that constitute the bulk of the United Nations. It is encouraging to observe that their influence has served to translate the issue from a clash of rigid, legalistic, and doctrinal standpoints to the problem of how the activities of the United Nations can be realistically financed and its constitution worked in such a way that its capacity to keep the peace will not be impaired.

It seems generally accepted that the whole problem of peace-keeping by the United Nations needs to be comprehensively reviewed. When occasion arises, my government will put forth its considered views on the various issues involved. At this stage, it is enough for me to state our basic assumptions. These are:

First, like all peace-loving states, Pakistan needs the United Nations with its capacity enhanced;

Second, this need will not be fulfilled if the United Nations departs radically from the Charter, unless there is agreement on suitable amendments to the Charter;

Third, the international community is confronted at present with problems, immediate and awesome, with which no other organization than the United Nations is equipped to deal;

Fourth, the present crisis will not be finally resolved unless we all candidly take stock of our respective experiences of the working of the United Nations in maintaining international peace and security and, in so doing, co-ordinate our viewpoints in order to evolve a common approach to its role and intervention in future.

It is enough to consider the international situation as a whole, and the problems and disputes which trouble various parts of the world, to realize the need for a continuous strengthening of the will and the ability of the international community to defend peace and make it possible for the world to work for the progress of its peoples. What is needed, as the United Nations Organization enters the twentieth year of its existence, a year which has been declared as the International Co-operation Year, is a reappraisal of its achievements and its shortcomings and a solemn rededication to its original principles and purposes. The League of Nations was established largely for the purpose of maintaining the *status quo* in Europe. Today, voices are again raised in favour of maintaining a world-wide *status quo* on the basis of something which has been described as the law of the cease-fire line.

Mr. President, the world is today going through a period of upheaval without precedent. It would be a delusion of the most dangerous kind to believe that the world, as it is today, however pleasant it might seem to some, can be maintained on the basis of make-shift solutions and a precariously balanced *status quo*. Around the world are problems that must be solved:

racial conflict, remnants of colonialism, nations divided by war or strategy, the human race divided among those who possess wealth beyond the wildest dreams of the alchemists and those for whom their daily crust of bread must fall like manna from heaven. Where, in a world thus divided, shall we draw our ceasefire lines? The United Nations must not be allowed to become the instrument of injustice and inequality. That is the way, not to peace and security, but to the quicksands of expediency and the maze of power politics. If this organization is not to go the way of the League of Nations, it must never lose sight of its very first purpose—to secure settlement of international disputes by peaceful means and in conformity with the principles of justice and international law.

The tendency of great powers to look at disputes between other nations not on their merits, but on their relation to their own power interests, the inconclusiveness of the proceedings of the Security Council because of this tendency, the complacent assumption that disputes between countries which are not militarily very powerful can easily be frozen, the refusal to make pronouncements on disputes in accordance with principles universally accepted—all these have been responsible for a state of affairs in which disputes not only remain unsolved but are aggravated by the passage of time.

While mankind places its hope on significant progress towards an abiding peace, stockpiles of weapons of mass destruction in the armouries of the great powers, and exactions made on their people by others not so great in their blind quest for acquiring more arms at any cost, constitute in themselves a cause of world tension and a growing threat to peace. In view of this deplorable state of affairs, disarmament acquires added urgency and becomes an important and vital end in itself. The Geneva disarmament talks will soon enter their fifth year. We must pay tribute to the patience of the members of the Geneva Conference, to the spirit of sincerity shown by many of them over the years. The goal of complete and general disarmament unfortunately remains as distant as ever. The partial Test Ban Treaty gives us no reason for complacence as long as we are unable to secure the objective of a total ban on the production, testing, and stockpiling of nuclear weapons. It is hard to see how these complex objectives can be achieved by a body which excludes one nuclear power and is not joined by another. It is essential that a new start should be made, on a realistic basis, to seek the elimination of arms and armaments, particularly those which threaten the very existence of civilization.

The most immediate problem, in this connection, is that of stopping the proliferation of nuclear weapons. My country is among those which have urged, year after year, in this Assembly that if the problem of the spread of nuclear weapons is not checked in time and if some firm arrangements are

not made to prevent conditions in which a sixth country joins the ranks of nuclear countries, one can be certain that, sooner or later, such a sixth nuclear power will emerge. This will necessarily be followed by yet other countries.

Let me recall here the words spoken by the President of Pakistan in his address to the Seventeenth Session of the General Assembly on September 26, 1962. He said, and I quote:

> "Permit me to observe that the mere adoption of resolutions against the dissemination of nuclear weapons and in favour of the establishment of a non-nuclear club will not remove this danger. Unless the United Nations takes effective and urgent action in this direction, the race in nuclear armaments is bound to overtake other parts of the world in the immediate future.
>
> "This imminent peril demands that the General Assembly give urgent consideration to the conclusion of a treaty to outlaw the further spread of nuclear weapons and the knowledge of their manufacture, whether by acquisition from the present nuclear powers or by any other means. The conclusion of such a treaty cannot wait until agreement is reached on other measures of disarmament."

In the International Atomic Energy Agency, Pakistan has always advocated and supported the strengthening of a system of safeguards against the use of atomic reactors for weapons purposes. With all its inadequacies, the international safeguards system offers some security against the future dissemination of nuclear weapons. We continue to believe that the Agency's system of safeguards should become mandatory and universal and that it should be developed to cover all aspects of nuclear capability. It has to be recognized, however, that matters have now reached a stage when a piecemeal strengthening of the Agency's safeguards and of their application in a haphazard manner will not meet the requirements of the situation. We would urge that an international conference should be called at which all the countries of the world, including those at present not members of the United Nations or not represented in it, should examine this whole question in detail and devise strict arrangements which would make it impossible for non-nuclear powers to manufacture or acquire nuclear weapons.

The Pakistan delegation have no doubt that such a measure would arrest the further deterioration of the present situation which threatens the world with a holocaust. It would also open the way to a more realistic attempt to achieve complete and general disarmament on a comprehensive and universal basis.

There has been a noticeable change in the mutual attitude of the Soviet Union and the United States of America. They have both demonstrated a

commendable willingness and ability to respond to the changing realities of the world situation. So far progress has perhaps been only symbolic. This needs to be developed so that a trend is established in the direction of a universal detente.

The logic of this consideration applies, with greater urgency, to the situation in South-East Asia.

In the ultimate analysis, such an approach cannot be confined to the political sphere. It is germane to the economic relations of different social systems and of nations in different economic conditions. Indeed, it has to be brought to bear on the economics of the world, where foundations can be laid for a stability in international relations. It is in this precise context that one of the most significant events of our time took place in Geneva last year.

I refer to the United Nations Conference on Trade and Development. Convening a conference of this size and scope was a major achievement and its results, notably the Final Act which was adopted unanimously, demonstrated the statesmanship, the understanding, and the spirit of co-operation of both the developed and the developing countries.

This conference represented a landmark; it marked the logical extension of the process of decolonization to the economic sphere. Its stimulus was a recognition of the fact that, though the colonial era has passed, the basic structure of international trade still denied the developing countries an equal voice and indeed an equal status in matters affecting their vital economic interests. Pakistan welcomed the conference as a signal that the newly emergent countries will no longer accept an anachronistic world order inherited from the dead colonial past.

The importance of the long-range objectives of the trade and development conference goes far beyond the economic sphere. They touch upon the basic principle of human solidarity. If they are realized, they will mark the extension to the international plane of those regulatory processes which all modern societies accept on the domestic plane in order to ensure a stability and an elementary justice in economic relations. Moreover, their realization will be a reliable insurance for peace because the so-called North-South problem, if it erupts in a confrontation between the rich and the poor on a global scale, can undermine any fabric of international security. My government feels that the task of reducing, and eventually eliminating, the gulf between the rich and the poor is perhaps the greatest responsibility assumed by the United Nations, and we hope that the collective wisdom of the world community will be equal to the test.

These are global ends and regional action is one of the means to their fulfilment.

We in Pakistan were happy to join the fraternal countries of Iran and

Turkey in Regional Co-operation for Development. The heads of state of the three countries launched the enterprise at their meeting in Istanbul in July, 1964, when a wide agreement was reached on greater freedom of communication among the three countries and the exploration of possibilities for creating mass consciousness of their common culture and civilization. This institution, instead of being exclusive, is open to accession by other countries in either all or some spheres of its activities. We hope that it will result in a broader base for our respective economies and in the enrichment of our cultures.

Whatever be the vantage point from which one looks at these regional or continental structures, no one can deny that they serve to bring various peoples together. By extending the horizons of nations, by inhibiting parochial tendencies, by opening new vistas for the peaceful assertion of economic and political rights, they check a relapse of the world community into those narrow, strident, and exclusive nationalisms which are the sole alternative to the United Nations. As such, they serve the cause of the United Nations and lend content to its message.

Mr. President, I would now briefly refer to the situation in Europe. Even though no final settlement of some of the major problems has yet taken place, it is a discernible fact that a measure of political and military equilibrium has been achieved. It would appear that the principal powers have reached a stage at which there is a greater understanding of the nature and extent of the danger of a military confrontation, and they have succeeded in reassuring themselves as to the adequacy of their respective security arrangements. Reassurance and confidence are gradually replacing despondency and fear. This is indeed a significant development. Europe is engaged in an endeavour to acquire a sense of cohesion and to play a distinctive role as a link between the Atlantic and the East.

Before we turn our attention from Europe, I would like to make a few observations about the Cyprus question. It is gratifying that the tragic crisis, which led to so much violence and bloodshed, is now under some control and conditions appear generally favourable for a durable settlement. My purpose in referring to the Cyprus question is to emphasize the need for resolute efforts towards a fair and final solution. Pakistan maintains that in the search for a final settlement, the relevant international agreements which were responsible for the emergence of Cyprus as a sovereign independent state are of paramount importance. It is only on the basis of a just settlement that lasting peace can be brought to the strife-torn island.

Turning now to the continent of Africa we find that, within the span of but a few years, the vibrant African peoples have severed the colonial chains which had held them in bondange for nearly a century. They have forged a continental unity. The emergence of the Organization of African Unity

bears witness to the vision and resourcefulness of African nations who have pledged their power to the struggle against the forces of colonialism and the inhuman policies of racial discrimination. Moreover, they have had the foresight to establish a machinery to seek peaceful solutions of inter-African disputes.

The post-independence history of several Afro-Asian countries shows that newly independent countries will have to exercise the greatest vigilance against colonialism and exploitation in its more subtle forms. The situation in the Congo is an example. It is most regrettable that outside intervention has further compounded a difficult problem which can finally be solved only by the Congolese themselves. However, we must give thought to this complex problem and determine to what extent we can assist the Congolese people in their quest for a solution of their problems. It has been our experience that United Nations operations by themselves have not served their intended purpose. It is a matter of regret that, instead of promoting stability, the result of such operations has been unsettling and, in some respects, tragic. If we draw the right lessons from our experience in dealing with the Congo problem, we must concede that a more practical way of assisting a solution in the Congo would be for the organization to delegate its responsibility to an organization such as the O.A.U. They have a vital stake in the Congo and their efforts would be based on a closer appreciation of the currents and cross-currents that seem to stand in the way of a just and equitable settlement in the Congo. Without rancour or recrimination, I would also submit that the use of non-African elements by the United Nations has been a factor which has been largely counter-productive. It is necessary, therefore, that the peaceful objectives of the world community and its collective goodwill should be exercised through the African Community which alone can render meaningful assistance to the people of the Congo. I would venture to suggest that such a delegation of responsibility should also be supported by financial and material contributions to the O.A.U. for the accomplishment of this important objective.

There will be no peace in Africa unless the remaining vestiges of colonialism—in Angola, Mozambique, South West Africa, and Southern Rhodesia—are eliminated and the peoples of these territories are granted the right to determine their own future. We are happy that two more African countries, Malawi and Zambia, achieved independence during the last year. My delegation extends to them, as well as to Malta, a warm welcome as new members of this world organization.

No reference to Africa can be complete without deploring the grave situation in South Africa which threatens, more than ever before, to shatter peace and plunge the continent of Africa into turmoil and bloodshed. The Government of South Africa has not been deflected from its

inhuman policies of apartheid and racial discrimination. Instead, it has let loose a reign of terror against the brave freedom fighters and imprisoned thousands of opponents of apartheid. It has thrown a challenge to world opinion and rejected all appeals and peaceful approaches made to it to abandon its policies which violate the principle of equality between man and man.

Mr. President, the problem of South Africa is not a problem of Africa alone. It is not only an anticipation of tragic consequences that compels our attention to it. In this twentieth century, when science and technology are helping the foundation of a single world community in which peoples of different nationalities, of different creeds, and of different races would live in peace and harmony and work for the collective good of mankind as a whole, it is anachronistic and intolerable that, in South Africa, a government should pursue the policy of dividing man from man on the basis of his birth. This is a matter which endangers the birth of an international community. It is not merely a matter of right or wrong but a matter of fact that the South African situation is a burden on the conscience of the human race. It threatens to arouse passions beyond our comprehension. This is no imaginary fear. Mankind's abhorrence of massacre and bloodshed is not a matter of controversy. The South African Government must be prevented from plunging headlong into a situation that can only lead to death and devastation, and that would make nonsense of our endeavour to provide for our children a better world. Such is the nature and magnitude of this problem, and it is for this reason that my delegation appeals to all to take individual and collective action against the South African Government. The Government of Pakistan has fully implemented the General Assembly resolution of 1962 and imposed a total embargo on trade with South Africa. I would urge sincerely that the major trading partners of South Africa apply economic sanctions against South Africa to demonstrate effectively their condemnation of the policy of apartheid from which the South African Government will not otherwise desist.

I would now like to deal with the region of the Indian Ocean. It is in Asia that actual war continues in the swamps and jungles of South Viet Nam. It is here that the threat of a confrontation between the nuclear powers now exists, carrying with it the risk of worldwide conflagration. It is in Asia, too, that secondary arms races are developing, increasing the danger of involvement by the great powers and diverting the resources and energies of the region from the urgent tasks of economic development. If international peace is to be safeguarded and a system of international security established as envisaged in the Charter of the United Nations, then a beginning must be made by seeking a durable settlement in Asia. Such an Asian settlement, to quote an eminent political commentator,

must stretch from the Yalu to the Himalayas. It is imperative that a beginning must be made, however daunting the task.

The most dangerous feature of the Asian situation is that one of the principal countries, in fact the country with the largest population in the whole world—the People's Republic of China—is sought to be isolated and quarantined from normal international relations. During the worst phase of the cold war, the line of communications between the Soviet Union and the Western powers was open and a dialogue between them, even if bitter and full of invective, could take place in this organization. But no communication has existed with China. For this reason alone, it should cause no surprise if policies relating to China's place and role in the world should be based on a lack of proper comprehension. It is imperative, therefore, not only for the effectiveness of the United Nations, but for the sake of the very peace of the world, that the People's Republic of China should be brought into the United Nations. Only then can a beginning be made towards regulating the situation in Asia and restoring to that vast and conflict-torn continent the peace and tranquillity which its peoples so desperately need. Unless this is done and done speedily, there can be no real progress towards meaningful disarmament. In fact, if the deliberations of the United Nations Organization should not continue to be deprived of the voice of a major world power and country with a population of 700 million people, if the unreality of this situation is to be ended—and indeed it has to be ended—then it is imperative that the People's Republic of China should take its place in our midst in this organization.

Mr. President, in the United Nations Organization rest the hopes and aspirations of mankind for an orderly progress towards peace and prosperity through justice and equality. It has come to embody our collective dedication to this high purpose. It is the duty of every member to bring to this forum a sense of history and a true spirit of the community of man. Much as we would like to dispense with incongruity and discordance, it is also one of our necessary functions that we should point out the dangers that lie in our path. These arise from policies pursued wilfully and in deliberation, policies that are contrary to the purposes of the United Nations, and that threaten to frustrate our collective quest for a better world order. It is indeed with the utmost regret that I now proceed to put on record a series of developments in our region which have the most dangerous possibilities, not only for those of us who are directly concerned, but also for those who live beyond our frontiers.

I draw your attention to the policy-makers of India who are determined to create tensions on their borders and produce an artificial situation for the exploitation of international rivalries. They have steadfastly refused to see merit in a policy of justice and equity, which would bring peace to the region

and strengthen natural affinities on the basis of honour and goodwill, and thus lay the foundations of a permanent peace, and bring a sense of security to the more than half a billion people of the South Asian subcontinent. The policies being pursued by Indian leaders are fraught with consequences detrimental to the whole world. For historic reasons, and because it is the largest of India's South Asian neighbours, Pakistan is the main focus of Indian hostility. But Pakistan is not the only country in the region to have felt the impact of Indian ambitions and chauvinism. India's smaller neighbours have had experience of the way in which India can ride roughshod over the legitimate interests of smaller countries when these happen to conflict with her ambitions. It was not for nothing that Senator Senanayake of Ceylon warned his country men to be on guard lest, like Kashmir, Ceylon too might fall under India's domination. Nepal's natural and legitimate interest in promoting closer relations with other countries has been for long impeded by pressures from India. Sikkim has been virtually occupied by Indian forces and in the once peaceful kingdom of Bhuttan, India ruthlessly makes use of financial and economic weapons to interfere in the internal affairs of that country.

Blinded by dreams of reviving the imagined glories of the past, India has embarked on a programme to extend her hegemony across the length and breadth of the Indian Ocean from the Hindu Kush to the Mekong. She has thus set her foot on the path of naked militarism and political adventure.

The five year plan of rearmament which India intends to carry out with the assistance of foreign powers will cost the staggering amount of twelve billion dollars.

A vast and fearsome panoply of war is being created in a country whose citizens eke out a life of misery on an average income of 35 cents per day, deprived of the most elementary amenities of human existence. Twelve billion dollars are to be spent on instruments and symbols of power by a country which, according to the recent statement made in Delhi by the Head of the Food and Agricultural Organization of the United Nations, must depend on the import of food grains for yet 30 years—the lifetime of a whole generation! And yet factories that might produce fertilizers will spew forth gunpowder. Steel that could be used to manufacture tractors will go instead into tanks.

This well publicized augmentation of arms is proceeding with the proclaimed object of defending India against an alleged threat of invasion by China. It is not my purpose to go into the history of the events that culminated in the hostilities between Indian forces and the forces of the Chinese People's Republic in October, 1962. A good deal has been written on the subject since then which throws light on the assertion that an

innocent and unwary India suddenly became victim of an aggressive and expansionist China during those October weeks. It has only to be recalled that a short while before the outbreak of the Sino-Indian conflict, Indian newspapers announced the order by the Indian Prime Minister to the Indian Army to drive out the Chinese from the disputed border regions and the establishment of a special task force under the command of General Kaul to achieve this objective. Be that as it may, the situation that exists on the undefined and disputed border between the People's Republic of China and India is one which needs to be settled. Of course, there is no reason for holding that it cannot be settled peacefully. Similar boundary differences have been amicably settled in all parts of the world and, in this very region, they have been settled between China and its other neighbours, like Afghanistan, Burma, Nepal, and Pakistan. The peculiarity of India's so-called confrontation with the People's Republic of China is that, while the situation on the ground remains quiet, every now and then a clamour is raised that Chinese troops are being concentrated, air space is being violated, incursions are taking place here, there and everywhere, and that India is about to be invaded. On the other hand, with all this picture of impending and imminent catastrophe, the major portion of India's forces continues to remain where they have always been, namely, in Jammu and Kashmir, on India's border with West Pakistan, and all round East Pakistan. Indian military missions come and go in the capitals of obliging great powers seeking supersonic planes, submarines, and tanks, and the like in order to strengthen India's fighting capacity in the mountains of the Himalayas. Can anyone seriously believe that China is preparing to invade India? Were that so, would China be calmly waiting while India augments her strength through a series of five year military plans? Indeed would China in October, 1962, have voluntarily called a cease-fire, withdrawn from parts of the disputed territory into which its troops had advanced, cleaned, oiled, and returned to India the guns left behind by its retreating troops? Even in the perpetration of this gigantic fiction, they give the lie to their own claims by keeping the great bulk of their fighting forces poised against Pakistan and adding submarines to their naval might. The fact is that the one abiding aim of Indian policy is to establish an Indian hegemony over the Indian Ocean region from the Hindu Kush to the Mekong.

A noted spokesman of modern India, Dr. Pannikkar, has described the outer limits of the Indian sphere of influence in the following words:

> "Our vision has been obscured by an un-Indian wave of pacifism. *Ahimsa* (non-violence) is no doubt a great religious creed, but this is a creed which India rejected when she refused to follow Buddha. The Hindu theory at all times, especially in the period of her historic greatness, was one of active assertion of the right, if necessary through the force of arms.

To the Indian Ocean, we shall have to turn, as our ancestors did, who conquered Socotra long before the Christian era, and established an empire in the Pacific."

Notwithstanding this open advocacy of a policy of expansion and domination, for a long time the posture of non-alignment served its purpose by enabling India to play off the United States against the Soviet Union. Today the Chinese bogey is being used to project the image of India as a bulwark of security and freedom for Asia and Africa against the so-called Chinese aggression and expansionism. Borrowing the language of the cold war, India now speaks not only of military conflict and invasion, but of a struggle between a Chinese ideology and a so-called Indian way of life. This image of selfless devotion to the noble cause of defending freedom and democracy in Asia and Africa does not unfortunately accord with the fact that India has, in the past, made frequent use of force, both military and economic, for the settlement of differences with its smaller neighbours. Is it conceivable that a re-armed and militant India will radiate a spirit of peaceful benevolence?

Those powers who are helping to re-arm India in the fond hope that India will become an example of stability and democracy are entitled to their illusions. Let us, however, beware of the high sounding platitudes in which Indian policy is expounded. The reality behind the verbal facade is very different. We get a glimpse of the reality when, after the fall of Mr. Khrushchev and resumption of Sino-Soviet contacts, there was alarm and despondency in India over the stoppage of Soviet military aid. The self-appointed torch-bearers of non-alignment now travel under the banner of double alignment and the apostles of peaceful co-existence pin their hopes on the continuation of world tensions!

An idea has now been put forward that, as a result of the Chinese atomic explosion, the non-nuclear powers are facing a new and unforeseen danger. It has been suggested that certain nuclear powers should join together to guarantee non-nuclear powers against nuclear attack. What does this proposal amount to? The Chinese test cannot be said to have created a new situation for Europe or for Latin America. This leaves the Indian Ocean area, at the centre of the land masses of Asia and Africa. It is here evidently that the proposal for a nuclear guarantee made by Prime Minister Shastri in London is intended to have its impact. What in fact is the real nature of this nuclear guarantee? "Umbrella" or "shield", it really amounts to no more than a lining up against the People's Republic of China of the other nuclear powers. This dangerous proposal would turn the Indian Ocean into a cockpit of great power conflict. This is in direct contradiction with the efforts and objective of Asian and African peoples which are persistently directed towards freeing their continents from any nuclear presence and

involvement.

Mr. President, my delegation, therefore, views the Indian proposal with serious concern. It would extend a nuclear hegemony into a non-nuclear area and thereby further complicate the already complex problem of disarmament. For Asia in particular, this would represent a misfortune of the greatest magnitude by bringing the entire continent under the perpetual shadow of nuclear weapons and extending the nature and scope of the confrontation between the great powers. If this dangerous proposal were to find support, it would inevitably have the effect of undermining the sovereignty and independence of the countries of Asia and Africa.

My country is a signatory of the Moscow Test Ban Treaty and we have always hoped that conditions will be created under which testing of nuclear weapons in all environments can be stopped and indeed their use and possession outlawed. The answer lies neither in self-righteousness nor in the sort of ingenious opportunism reflected in the plan of a nuclear umbrella. An agreement for the prevention of the spread of nuclear weapons can be brought about only if all existing nuclear powers participate in it. If, on the other hand, it is sought to align some of the nuclear powers against others for the benefit of non-nuclear states, or one such state, all the chances of arriving at an urgent, comprehensive agreement will vanish. Even in this respect, the Indian proposal strikes at the roots of mankind's urge to restrict, and possibly to eliminate, the proliferation and presence of nuclear weapons. Where we, the nations of Asia and Africa, intend to reduce tensions, India seeks to add tension to tension. Whereas we desperately need disarmament, India embarks upon rearmament. Where we want peaceful settlement of disputes, India seeks to resolve them by force.

What is needed is a fresh and sincere effort at a general settlement which would attack the problem of international security simultaneously on the front of armaments as well as of the settlement of disputes and differences which are a potential threat to peace and likely to lead to a resort of war.

It is imperative that India must be restrained from involving the great powers in an arms race in the region of the Indian Ocean. It is not only in the context of India's contemporary aggressive postures and the record of her recent conduct that Pakistan and other neighbouring countries feel alarmed. There are historical reasons why the introduction of an arms race in the area causes serious disquiet. It is a historical fact that the British empire in India was the direct result of conflict and turmoil among the peoples of this area who were helped to wage war against each other by the British East India Company and its French rivals. The adventures of Clive and Duplex must not be re-enacted in the twentieth century. This is indeed a matter of serious concern not only for Pakistan and India, but for the whole of Africa and Asia, since it represents a positive danger of outside

domination and influence. I do not wish to labour the point, but I would emphasize the need to refrain from military interference in Africa and Asia in the interest of world peace.

If in this connection I refer to Jammu and Kashmir, it is not only because the problem of Kashmir is closest to the heart of Pakistan and because it affects the lives and the well-being of the hundreds of millions of people who inhabit the South Asian sub-continent, nor even because the peace and security of that region are affected by the continuance of this increasingly bitter dispute. I do so because Jammu and Kashmir is, above all, a test of the ability of the United Nations to live up to its own high purposes and to meet the challenge to international order and law by states which will set themselves above the law. Jammu and Kashmir is not the only case in which a member state has flouted the resolutions of the United Nations and persistently refused to honour its obligations under the Charter of the United Nations. Kashmir is only the most insidious instance of the way in which the very purpose of the United Nations Charter may be defeated by bad faith on the one hand and expediency and power politics on the other.

Members are aware that this problem, which has been before the Security Council now for years, was again considered last year by that body, at the instance of Pakistan. It was the unanimous view of members that both parties should meet in order to reach a just and honourable settlement of the problems that have prevented the solution of the Kashmir dispute for so long. In his summing up of May 18, 1964, the President of the Council, His Excellency Ambassador Seydoux of France, speaking on behalf of the members of the Council, addressed the parties as follows:—

"(e) The members of the Council expressed the hope that the two parties would abstain from any act that might aggravate the situation and that they would take such measures as would re-establish an atmosphere of moderation between the two countries and also peace and harmony among the communities.

(f) The members of the Council expressed the hope that in the light of our recent debate, the two countries concerned would resume their contacts as soon as possible in order to resolve by negotiation their differences, in particular their differences related to Jammu and Kashmir."

Mr. President, Pakistan has at no moment shown any reluctance to hold bilateral talks with India for the settlement of the problem of Kashmir. In the 17 years during which this problem has festered and grown bitter, more than a score of suggestions have been made by eminent mediators and conciliators appointed by the United Nations in order to bring the parties together and to move the dispute towards a final solution. Each one of these proposals was designed to meet the objections raised by India to the

implementation of the United Nations resolutions on Kashmir. But even though every single proposal was accepted by Pakistan, none could be put into effect because of India's refusal to accept any conditions under which the people of Kashmir would be enabled to exercise, in a truly free manner, their right to decide the future affiliation of the state.

On many occasions, we have held bilateral talks with India. Pakistan is even today ready to discuss with India the modalities by which the people of Jammu and Kashmir may exercise their right of self-determination. Pakistan is equally prepared to submit to the opinion of the International Court of Justice, or the arbitration of any other agency, by mutual agreement the differences that stand in the way of implementation of the United Nations resolutions on Kashmir. What Pakistan cannot, and shall never, accept is that the people of Kashmir should be deprived of their birthright and be held in bondage under alien rule.

In occupied Kashmir repression increases as revolt and resentment grow. The meeting of the Plebiscite Front held in November, 1964, at Sopore in occupied Kashmir itself, reaffirmed the determination of the people of Kashmir to continue their struggle until the right of self-determination is achieved and the intruder expelled from their homeland. The Government of India, having failed to silence the voice of the Kashmiris, was obliged to set free Shaikh Abdullah who for long years languished in Indian jails for no other fault than that he had spoken up for the rights of his people.

Today, as the latest Indian puppet postures on behalf of his masters, the Government of India have cast aside all pretensions and are preparing to absorb Jammu and Kashmir into India by imposing upon it the direct rule of the President of India. This latest defiance of obligations is a clear indication of the lack of sincerity which characterizes India's relations with its neighbours and in particular with Pakistan.

Mr. President, India is following a deliberate policy of denial of the right of self-determination not only in the case of Kashmir but in its suppression of the valiant tribesmen of Nagaland. As the whole world is aware, this is not an isolated phenomenon where the Government of India is concerned. This is only a manifestation of an earlier trend which was demonstrated by the fall of India's heavy hand on the people of Hyderabad and Junagadh and by a deliberate and ruthless policy of animosity against Pakistan which the Government of India initiated and followed relentlessly from the birth of Pakistan up to this moment.

I want to declare with all the emphasis at my command that India's attempt to pursue its policies of national chauvinism in flagrant violation of its international commitments and in open contempt of the principle of self-determination, which is an article of faith with nations and with men

of goodwill throughout the world, will and must be frustrated. A dangerous situation is being created in South and South-East Asia by India's attempt to set herself up as a successor to a colonial regime. This represents an attempt to reverse the entire history of the liberation of peoples from the colonial yoke and their struggle for national independence which has become enshrined in the conscience of our times.

My country has had to contend with the declared ill-will and active hostility of India at every turn and corner. The world at large, however, has yet to recognize the gravity of the situation caused by the deliberate and inhuman policy of evictions by the Government of India and perpetrated on its own people, which has already resulted in the entry into Pakistan of nearly half a million Indian Muslims. For India it is not enough merely to acquire vast quantities of military aid to intimidate her neighbours. She is prepared to use innocent lives even of her own citizens if they can be employed as an instrument of exerting additional pressure. In this case the victims are the Indian Muslims. The callous and inhuman treatment to which these Indian Muslims are being put merely because they follow the same faith as the majority of the people in Pakistan is a blot on the conscience of civilization. The purpose is clearly to maintain a continuous and overwhelming pressure on the eastern half of Pakistan, a part of the country which already has one of the highest densities of population in the whole world.

Ejected from their homes, deprived of their goods and property, and forcibly pushed across the Indian border into East Pakistan on the unfounded charge that they are "Pakistani infiltrators", the evicted Indian Muslims present a spectacle of inhumanity. They are a source of grave tension. The Government of Pakistan has done everything possible to avoid a conflagration. A commission of enquiry headed by a retired Judge of the Dacca High Court was appointed by the Government of Pakistan to examine the national status of these persons. The Government of India was invited to send its representatives to sit on this commission but it refused to do so. The commission examined a large number of evicted families and on the basis of documentary and other evidence it found that the vast majority of the so-called "Pakistani infiltrators" evicted by India were in fact Indian Muslims who owned properties, earned their livelihood, and in many cases had voted in the elections, in India. These findings have been borne out by the Jamaat-i-Ulema-i-Hind, an Indian political organisation, and by General Cariappa, former Commander-in-Chief of India, who came to East Pakistan last autumn and personally visited relief camps where the evicted Indian Muslims have been temporarily housed by the Government of East Pakistan. It is indeed a sad commentary on the much vaunted secularism of Indian society and her political institutions that everyone of the

persons expelled from India as an alleged infiltrator is a Muslim!

I said here in this Assembly last year that Pakistan was prepared to accept the determination by an impartial tribunal or some other body under international auspices whether or not the persons expelled as infiltrators were really Pakistani citizens as alleged by India or whether they were Indian citizens who have been turned out from their ancestral homes, deprived of their means of livelihood and evicted for no other reason than that they practise the religion of Islam. This offer was repeated to the Indian Government when the Home Ministers of India and Pakistan met last year to discuss the question of the treatment of minorities in the two countries and the eviction of Muslims of India. The Government of India turned down this eminently reasonable proposal on the ground that it would infringe on their sovereign right to decide the nationality of their citizens.

Now it is true that the right to determine whether a person is the national of a certain country must rest *prima facie* with that country. In the present case, even if the matter were to be considered in purely legalistic terms, India has no right to determine unilaterally that the persons involved are Pakistanis and then to push them across the border into Pakistan. The matter is not one which ought to be dealt with in these terms.

Eviction of Muslims from India has caused alarm and uncertainty among the 50 million Muslims of India and resentment and bitterness in Pakistan. There are 10 million Hindus in Pakistan. It has been the policy of the Government of Pakistan to make sure that the minorities are enabled not only to live in peace and security but to flourish and prosper as honoured citizens of the country. It is a matter of the deepest regret to Pakistan that, as a result of the continuing tension between the two countries and the large-scale rioting which took place in various parts of India last year, some disturbances broke out in East Pakistan and a number of Hindus were led by their fears to flee the country. I am happy to say that many of these persons have now returned to Pakistan and many more are returning. Upto the end of last year, more than 50,000 had already returned and been settled in their homes and restored to their properties. There can be no clearer proof of the policy of justice and generosity which the Government of Pakistan is following with regard to the minorities in Pakistan.

By contrast, the fate of the 50 million Muslims and of the other minorities in India is constantly in the balance. It is not only the Hindu revivalist parties who openly advocate an exchange of population between India and Pakistan on religious grounds. Speaking in the West Bengal Legislative Council, the Provincial Chief Minister, Mr. P. C. Sen, stated that the total evacuation of Hindus from East Pakistan over a period of 5 years was possible.

In the context of the complexities of the present international situation,

India is pursuing policies which will lead us headlong into an era of darkness and strife. It is our solemn duty to make every possible endeavour to prevent this ; and I would like to assure you that Pakistan is determined to spare no effort to resist, and fight against, this threat.

In conclusion, I would remind this great assembly that it is necessary to undertake the task of arresting this rapid deterioration in the interest of world peace. For in the twentieth century, no country stands alone in fighting tyranny. The Afro-Asian world in particular is conscious of the dangers that might flow from this deplorable situation. It has been our sincere endeavour over the years to seek a settlement with honour and justice and thereby protect not only ourselves but our region.

Mr. President, there are forces in Africa and Asia which are positive and represent the wave of the future. Asia and Africa are no longer passive and sterile, led one way or the other, according to the dictates of great power politics. They have emerged with a distinct personality of their own. Notwithstanding the brief period that has elapsed since their emancipation, they are not only prepared but determined to play their rightful role in shaping and making their fullest contribution to the welfare of the world community. The historic Bandung Conference played a decisive role in giving substance to the Asian-African personality. My delegation considers it a privilege to announce to this forum with full confidence that the forthcoming conference in Algiers will not only be a milestone in our contemporary history. It will herald the birth of a mighty force which will be wielded for the collective good of humanity at large. It will seek to eliminate the last remnants of colonialism from our region. It will be animated by a spirit of dedication to the progress and development of freedom and justice for all without exception. We have faith that the second African-Asian conference will lay the foundation of a new spirit, a new force, resolute and determined to work for the collective aspirations of the entire human race. We are also confident that the countries of Africa and Asia will draw a lesson from history and proceed to take concrete steps against the continuance of inequality and injustice which has bedevilled the history of man from time immemorial.

In making these assertions, my delegation is fully conscious of the fact that this is indeed the rostrum from which such a declaration should be made, as the Asian and African member-states constitute the majority of the United Nations. It is in this understanding, Mr. President, that we appeal to our fellow member-states that they should, without exception, lend their support, and give their blessing, to the second African-Asian conference that has set itself a historic purpose of such significance. In so doing, they will be expressing their own dedication to the high purposes and the lofty ideals of the United Nations Organization.

Address to the Thirteen Hundred and Thirty-Ninth Plenary Meeting of the United Nations General Assembly on September 28, 1965

Mr. President,

I should first of all like to congratulate you on your election to the presidency of the Assembly. We count it a good fortune of this Assembly to have your guidance. Your personal stature and renown and the fact that you represent a country with which Pakistan has friendly ties are a source of special gratification to us.

The outstanding development of the present century is the emergence of the peoples of Africa and Asia from an era of colonial domination. There are no two opinions about the need for completing this process of emancipation by liquidating the remaining vestiges of colonial rule wherever they might still exist.

The question that the world community has to face is how to reinforce the principle of equality and the recognition of diversity in the attitudes of Member States. A progressive equilibrium needs to be established between norms of international conduct and the need to accommodate maximum diversity. The physical and human realities of Asia and Africa make it imperative that unity should be sought through diversity. The need for tranquillity is paramount for the countries of Asia and Africa to enable them to secure for themselves an orderly transition. They must be free to reach their own equilibrium and find their own levels. They must be assisted in a constructive manner to consolidate their political independence through economic and social emancipation. The international community should be mindful of its responsibilities. It should recognize that it is no longer possible to think in terms of spheres of influence. The dynamics of the present world situation is such that classification in terms of exclusive influence becomes futile. Events tend to bring about rapid shifts of gravity.

Realities transcend political alignments and groupings.

While promoting the growth of the African-Asian personality, the peoples of Africa and Asia are not only mindful of their own needs. They are also anxious to avoid the conflict and strife which could neutralize their national efforts, increase global tensions and jeopardize the very purpose and justification for the momentous changes that have taken place in recent times. It is now that we need to make a determined effort to prevent developments from taking place which could lead to a confrontation between the resurgent forces of Africa and Asia on the one hand and the more powerful countries of the world on the other.

The countries of Africa and Asia met in Bandung over ten years ago. On that historic occasion they demonstrated their collective desire to establish norms of co-operation and international conduct which have been acclaimed throughout the world. The Bandung principles represent a landmark in the evolution of an orderly international society. The concept of African-Asian solidarity is not exclusive or parochial. Its objectives are humane. It is our profound belief that in attending to our fundamental needs we promote the cause of world peace and co-operation. We feel confident that our efforts will receive commendations and encouragement. The greater cohesion of Africa and Asia and their freedom from exploitation and domination will be a powerful insurance against future conflict.

No discussion of the scheme of things in Asia and Africa would be complete without a reference to the People's Republic of China. In fact the lack of Chinese participation lends a distinct air of unreality to our deliberations even in this World Organization. In these crucial times, when developments are taking place which might well prove decisive to the entire future of humanity, it is highly regrettable that China has been excluded so far from the United Nations ; but, if this exclusion continues, the United Nations will find itself powerless to apply itself effectively to international problems, particularly to those in Asia. At a time when the need for strengthening the United Nations is advocated, it is ironical that the one logical and most important step in that direction, namely the seating of the representative of the People's Republic of China in this Organization, has yet to be taken. Our experience in recent years has proved conclusively that the United Nations without the People's Republic of China is as incomplete as a triangle with two sides. Either the United Nations moves forward towards greater effectiveness or it is bound to be overtaken by events. If the world continues to stand by and allow this to take place, it will in fact be guilty of unpardonable shortsightedness.

The world has been deeply concerned over the conflict between India and my country. This has found expression in the statements of speakers in this debate. Though there might be a difference of emphasis in their state-

ments, there are two common thoughts in them: first, sorrow at this conflict; second, the conviction that the cease-fire this time must lead to a final settlement of the grave political problem underlying the conflict, namely, the future of the State of Jammu and Kashmir, which is in dispute. Pakistan shares both of them.

The war with India is not of our seeking. It is a war of self-defence against an armed attack launched on our borders without warning on the morning of 6 September and aimed at the seizure of Lahore, our second largest city and the very heart of Pakistan. We are defending the integrity of our territory and the sanctity to the right to self-determination of the people of Jammu and Kashmir, which the Government of India has denied them, despite its promises and pledges to them, for the past eighteen long years. Those two principles are inseparable. We can no more surrender the one than forsake the other.

We find that impartial world opinion—the opinion that transcends the pressures and postures of power politics—has awakened to the need for a just and final settlement of the Jammu and Kashmir dispute. Who except India could be so purblind as to deny that the problem of Jammu and Kashmir, the problem of the life and future of 5 million human beings, the problem that has twice led to war between India and Pakistan and that threatens the future of 600 million people, needs now to be settled on a just and permanent basis?

It is because the Kashmir dispute so clearly involves principles of the widest human scope that Governments and peoples everywhere have supported Pakistan in the crisis which we are facing today. I should like to take this opportunity, on behalf of my country and my people, to express in this forum our deep and heartfelt gratitude for the moral and material support extended to Pakistan by many countries of the world. I should like in particular to mention that in our hour of peril we were not forsaken by our brothers in Iran and Turkey; the great bloc of Arab countries stretching from the great ocean of Asia and Africa to the Atlantic Ocean, to which Pakistan is linked, let me say, not merely by ties of religion and of common culture but by common adherence to the idea of justice and peace; and our great neighbour to the north, the People's Republic of China, which gave us full moral support and, rising high above ideological differences, upheld the cause of righteousness to condemn the war of aggression launched against us by India. To the Government and people of Indonesia I should like to address a special word of thanks—that great nation of 100 million people unrepresented in this Assembly. From this rostrum permit me, on behalf of the Government and people of Pakistan, to pay a lasting tribute to the President of Indonesia, to the Government of Indonesia and to the great people of Indonesia, who gave us brave and

unstinting support in our moment of need and crisis.

The people of Pakistan shall not forget the many proofs of true friendship given by the Indonesian President. The bonds that bind our two peoples have been tempered by this crisis and have become stronger than steel.

These countries and peoples have given us their support because ours is not a local or a parochial cause. In supporting us, they support one of the main objectives of the United Nations: peace with justice. They uphold the principle that you cannot settle a problem pertaining to a people if you by-pass that people, ignore that people; and they affirm that in this post-colonial age we cannot sanction a new colonialism—that of India's domination in Jammu and Kashmir.

The attitude of these Governments is a proof that the old categories, the facile classifications, of the cold war are now obsolete. Some of these Governments are aligned, some are non-aligned; in both cases they have shown to them the considerations of justice and fairness come before all other considerations.

Since the whole world has been concerned with the failure thus far to resolve the Jammu and Kashmir dispute, I must refer to at least two or three basic issues involved in it. The first and the foremost is the right of self-determination of the people of Jammu and Kashmir. The second issue is the sanctity of international agreements, especially those brought about by the United Nations itself. The third is the effectiveness of the United Nations in securing pacific settlement of international disputes.

I need hardly emphasize that the principle of self-determination is an integral element of the international order embodied in the United Nations. Indeed, being older than the United Nations, it is basic to the political civilization which this Organization seeks to represent.

This principle was the basis of many territorial settlements achieved in Europe from the middle of the last century which have proved enduring. The emergence of Norway in 1905, and of Poland, Czechoslovakia and Yugoslavia after the First World War; the incorporation of Schleswig in Denmark and of the Sarr in Germany—these are outstanding examples which attest to the universal recognition of the principle of self-determination.

It was against this background that the peoples' right of self-determination was proclaimed in the Atlantic Charter of 14 August 1941; in the United Nations Declaration, signed in Washington on 1 January 1942 ; in the 1943 Moscow Declaration; and in the Cairo Declaration of 26 November 1943. This principle was finally embodied in Article 1 paragraph 2 of the Charter, which provides that one of the purposes of the United Nations is :

"To develop friendly relations among nations based on respect for

the principle of equal rights and self-determination of peoples, and to take other appropriate measures to strengthen universal peace".

This principle was also enshrined in Articles 55, 73 and 76 of the Charter. Furthermore, it was upheld in the Declaration of the Bandung Conference of 1955, in the Charter of the Organization of African Unity, and in the Declaration of the Second Conference of Non-Aligned Countries in 1964.

During the lifetime of the United Nations, the accession to independence of Morocco, Tunisia and Algeria, as well as the emergence of a number of other African States that are now respected Members of this Organization, from the status of Trust Territories was expressly based on the principle of self-determination, on ascertaining and respecting the wishes of the peoples involved.

The principle of self-determination was also at the root of the partition of the sub-continent and the emergence of India and Pakistan as separate sovereign States in August 1947. It was explicitly applied to those princely states the accession of which to India or to Pakistan was in dispute. Indeed, referring to the Jammu and Kashmir dispute, Prime Minister Jawaharlal Nehru of India himself acknowledged this principle clearly on 2 November 1947 in the following words:

> "And let me make it clear that it has been our policy all along that where there is a dispute about the accession of a state to either Dominion, the accession must be made by the people of that state."

India's representative in the Security Council on the Jammu and Kashmir dispute repeated it when he said:

> "When he"—the ruler of a small state—"takes one view and his people take another view, the wishes of the people have to be ascertained. When so ascertained the ruler has to take action in accordance with the verdict of the people. That is our position."

This is also the position of Pakistan with regard to Jammu and Kashmir. It only demands that a plebiscite be held under United Nations auspices in the State of Jammu and Kashmir to enable those people to decide for themselves whether their state should accede to India or to Pakistan ; in other words that the people of Jammu and Kashmir should be granted the right of self-determination.

This right was first recognized clearly by President Woodrow Wilson in his address before the League To Enforce Peace when he said: "We believe that every people has a right to choose the sovereignty under which it shall live".

In a speech on 24 January 1918 he said that "self-determination is not a mere phrase ; it is an imperative principle of action which statesmen will henceforth ignore at their peril".

That this principle has not been confined to one political system or

philosophy is pointedly brought home to us by the first official pronouncement of the Soviet Government after the Revolution of 1917, which was the Decree of Peace adopted by the All-Russian Convention of Soviets', Workers', Soldiers' and Peasants' Deputies of 8 November 1917. This historic declaration demanded an immediate peace without forcible annexation and without indemnity, and defined as forcible annexation the retention by any State of any nation without the latter being given the right of free voting in the determination of the forms of its national existence "under the conditions of the complete removal of the armies of the annexing or the more powerful nation". This Decree was reported in the *Izvestia* of 29 October and 9 November 1917.

More recently, the Charter of the Organization of African Unity, in its very first paragraph, stated : "... it is the inalienable right of all peoples to control their own destiny".

Still more recently, the Declaration of the Second Conference of Heads of State or Government of Non-Aligned Countries, held in Cairo in 1964, stated:

> "The Conference solemnly reaffirms the right of peoples to self-determination and to make their own destiny.
>
> "It stresses that this right constitutes one of the essential principles of the United Nations Charter, that it was laid down also in the Charter of the Organization of African Unity, and that the Conferences of Bandung and Belgrade demanded that it should be respected, and in particular insisted that it should be effectively exercised.
>
> "The Conference notes that this right is still violated or its exercise denied in many regions of the world and results in a continued increase of tension and the extension of the areas of war.
>
> "The Conference denounces the attitude of those powers which oppose the exercise of the right of peoples to self-determination.
>
> "It condemns the use of force, and all forms of intimidation, interference and intervention which are aimed at preventing the exercise of this right".

This Delcaration also stated:

> "The process of liberation is irresistible and irreversible. Colonized peoples may legitimately resort to arms to secure the full exercise of their right to self-determination and independence if the colonial powers persist in opposing their natural aspirations."

Every word in these declarations, these expressions of the great forces of history, sanctions Pakistan's standpoint on Jammu and Kashmir. When we say that there cannot be any enduring settlement of the Jammu and Kashmir question without that settlement being freely accepted by the people immediately concerned, we take our stand on the principles so

clearly reaffirmed in the Declaration of the Cairo Conference and enshrined in the Charter of the Organization of African Unity.

When we insist that India cannot be allowed to annex Jammu and Kashmir forcibly, that the people of Jammu and Kashmir should be given the right of free voting to determine their accession to India or Pakistan, that this right can be exercised only when India's army is completely removed from Jammu and Kashmir, we follow exactly the Leninist Decree of Peace.

Is it imaginable that, on an issue of this nature, Pakistan will compromise on the basic principle of self-determination and ever be a party to a settlement that negates or displaces it in any way? Is it reasonable that any responsible power, having due regard to the basic norms of international life, will ever expect us to do so?

But despite the universal recognition of this principle, there are always some powers that try, albeit vainly, to turn back the whole current of history. Human greed being what it is, we find colonial powers—in Angola and Mozambique, in Southern Rhodesia and in South West Africa—denying a people their right to choose their own destiny as India denies it to the people of Jammu and Kashmir. The technique employed by this small but assorted company is one and the same. It is not to question the principle as such, but to assert that it does not apply to the case involved. The excuse is always available to them that the colony is an integral part of their metropolitan territory, or that they are building multi-racial or multi-religious societies and, if they permit the self-determination of one group or area, their whole state may disintegrate. In pleading this excuse, they try to exploit the fear of dismemberment among many sovereign states.

That this plea is specious and is meant only to delude the world is apparent to anyone who is acquainted with the history of modern colonialism and the struggle for emancipation of subjugated peoples.

Indian leaders argue that self-determination is a disruptive principle which will lead to the dismemberment of states in Africa and Asia. They assert that the survival of India as a democracy, as a secular state, indeed as a united country would be at stake if a plebiscite were to be held in Jammu and Kashmir, the very same plebiscite which India pledged to the people of Jammu and Kashmir eighteen years ago.

This argument has been answered by a well-known Indian leader. Allow me to quote Mr. Jayaprakash Narayan :

"... if we are so sure of the verdict of the people of Kashmir, why are we so opposed to giving them another opportunity to reiterate it? The answer given is that this would start the process of disintegration of India. Few things have been said in the course of this controversy more silly than this one. The assumption behind the argument is that the

States of India are held together by force and not by the sentiment of a common nationality. It is an assumption that makes a mockery of the Indian nation and a tyrant of the Indian State".

I do not consider it appropriate to go into the question of the nature of Indian secularism and democracy, although much can be said on that subject. I will only say that it would not be rational for Pakistan to wish the destruction or weakening of the Indian Union. Pakistan's own progress and stability cannot be served by chaos and disruption across its border. Quite the contrary. Whether Indian fears in this respect are the nightmare of a feverish imagination, or just another stratagem by which India has for eighteen years prevented the implementation of its own international agreement on Kashmir, is a question which needs to be dispassionately considered and answered.

The forcible annexation of Jammu and Kashmir by India is not a guarantee of Indian secularism, democracy or territorial integrity. On the contrary, it keeps alive those very fears and suspicions which made it impossible for the Muslim minority to accept a united Indian State. If the Nagas, the Sikhs and other communities have grievances against the Government of India, then the fate of Jammu and Kashmir can only act as a spur to their fears and suspicions. The Nagas and the Sikhs can be pacified, not by the example of forcible occupation of Jammu and Kashmir, but by a just redress of their grievances.

India has long used the argument that the fabric of Indian secularism is too weak to withstand a decision by the people of Jammu and Kashmir to opt for Pakistan. Indian propaganda has raised the spectre of the majority community falling upon the 50 million Muslims of India if Kashmir opted for Pakistan. I will not try to answer the question whether such a mediaeval and reactionary and undemocratic argument is worthy of the country which claims to be a great secular and modern democracy. The fact is, however, that nothing of the kind will happen, unless the Indian Government permits it to happen. This is pure and simple blackmail to prevent the people of Jammu and Kashmir from exercising their right of free choice.

It is pertinent here to quote from an editorial in the *Times*, London, of 23 September 1965:

> ". . . one of their arguments against any consultation of Kashmiri opinion—that it would lead inevitably to communal trouble throughout India—has been disproved in conditions far more tense than any such consultation could evoke."

India asserts that the dispute between Pakistan and India is not concerned with the rights of the people of Jammu and Kashmir but is a struggle between democracy and autocracy, between freedom and dictatorship, between secularism and theocracy, between rationalism and fanaticism.

I shall not go into the history which made inevitable the creation of the two independent and sovereign states in the sub-continent. For 800 years Muslims ruled the sub-continent. It is for historians to ponder at the question why in the long period of intermingling, followed by two centuries of unitary administration under the British, it was not possible for a sense of common nationality to emerge in the sub-continent. It is sufficient to say that history cannot be undone.

The struggle which led to the creation of Pakistan was not a struggle between secularism and religion but between two nationalisms—the Muslim nationalism which led to the creation of Pakistan and which is heir to the 800 years of Muslim rule, and the Hindu nationalism which harkened back for its inspiration to the epoch of Hindu greatness before the Muslims came to the subcontinent. The creation of Pakistan, where Muslims would be free to develop in accordance with their culture and way of life, was the result of the democratic process of self-determination in which each of the provinces which today form part of Pakistan freely and formally expressed its desire to do so. Kashmir alone of those states, provinces and territories of pre-partitioned India has been deprived of the right to participate in this process of self-determination.

That is the basic fact. India cannot deny it because, in the very letter accepting the Maharaja's accession, India's Head of State declared on 27 October 1947:

> "In consistence with their policy that, in the case of any State where the issue of accession has been the subject of dispute, the question of accession should be decided in accordance with the wishes of the people of the State, it is my Government's wish that as soon as law and order have been restored in Kashmir and her soil cleared of the invader, the question of the State's accession should be settled by a reference to the people."

India cannot deny it because, immediately after the Maharaja's accession, the Prime Minister, Jawaharlal Nehru, of India said in a telegram to the Prime Minister of Pakistan:

> "Our view, which we have repeatedly made public, is that the question of accession in any disputed territory or State must be decided in accordance with the wishes of the people and we adhere to this view."

India cannot deny it because the Prime Minister of India solemnly stated again on 2 November 1947:

> "Let me make it clear that it has been our policy all along that where there is a dispute about the accession of a state to either Dominion, the accession must be made by the people of that state. It is in accordance with this policy that we have added a proviso to the Instrument of Accession of Kashmir."

Finally, India cannot deny it because the Prime Minister of India, Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru, stated in the Constituent Assembly of India on 25 November 1947:

"In order to establish our *bona fides*, we have suggested that when the people are given the chance to decide their future, this should be done under the supervision of an impartial tribunal such as the United Nations. The issue in Kashmir is whether violence and naked force should decide the future or the will of the people."

This is exactly what we have said all these years, and we say today : Let India establish its *bona fides*, let the people of Kashmir be given the chance to decide their future which was pledged to them by India, let this be done under the impartial auspices of the United Nations, let not violence and naked force but the will of the people decide the future of Jammu and Kashmir.

This is the basic issue involved in Jammu and Kashmir. Of equal importance is the issue of honouring of obligations undertaken through international agreements. This agreement was concluded between India and Pakistan when a plan of settlement of the Jammu and Kashmir dispute was negotiated by the United Nations Commission, submitted to the two Governments, and accepted by both Governments. The plan embodied in the United Nations Commission for India and Pakistan (UNCIP) resolutions of 13 August 1948 and 5 January 1949 provided for :

(1) a cease-fire and the demarcation of a cease-fire line ; (2) the demilitarization of the State of Jammu and Kashmir ; and (3) a free and impartial plebiscite under the auspices of the United Nations to determine the question of the accession of the State to India or Pakistan.

It was upon acceptance of both resolutions by India and Pakistan that hostilities ceased on 1 January 1949. Then, as now, the cease-fire was meant to be a prelude to a permanent settlement which was to be achieved through a plebiscite under United Nations auspices after a synchronised withdrawal of forces.

The whole history of the Jammu and Kashmir dispute is India's exploitation of the cease-fire, the first part of the agreement, for the purpose of evading the implementation of the other two parts, rather than of facilitating them.

But the non-performance of an agreement by one party cannot render it invalid or obsolete. If it did, there would be no order in international life and the entire basis of the United Nations Charter would be undermined. Even though the agreement embodied in the two United Nations resolutions was not implemented by India, the Security Council repeatedly made clear its binding nature as an agreement and affirmed that its provisions were recognized and accepted by both India and Pakistan.

As the distinguished representative in the Security Council, Justice Sunde of Norway, said at the 467th the meeting of the Council :

> ". . . It is for the plebiscite to determine the ulimate fate of the State.
>
> "I would like to add that this principle, this keystone of the whole structure, has an importance which transcends the obligatory force it derives from the consent of the parties. The principle has its intrinsic value because it embodies the only criterion for the determinatjon of Kashmir's fate which is compatible with modern democratic ideals."

That the UNCIP resolutions represent the engagement of the parties to the process and method by which the final settlement of the Kashmir dispute is to be reached has been reaffirmed not only by the Security Council. It has also been repeatedly admitted by India itself. I shall quote only two of these statements.

At the 608th meeting of the Security Council, the representative of India, Mrs. Pandit, said:

> "We do not seek to go behind the UNCIP resolutions or to ignore the vital elements of principle contained in them . . . We have always adhered to the UNCIP resolutions . . . We cannot be a party to the reversal of previous decisions taken by the United Nations Commission with the agreement of the parties."

At the 773rd meeting of the Security Council, the Indian representative and former Defence Minister of India, Mr. Krishna Menon, said :

> "We have accepted [the resolutions of the United Nations Commission for India and Pakistan], we are parties to them, whether we like them or not."

I repeat the words, "whether we like them or not".

India is a party to the UNCIP resolutions, whether India likes them or not. That it does not like them is no ground to consider them obsolete. It had been made clear by the United Nations Commission itself that the lack of co-operation from either side would not be considered a technical or practical reason for not holding a plebiscite in Jammu and Kashmir. Such lack of co-operation, the Commission held, would be a breach of commitments formally undertaken by the Governments of India and Pakistan.

The agreement with regard to plebiscite binds not only India and Pakistan, it also binds the United Nations. Because of its binding nature and because of the principle of the *stipulations pour autrui* it involves third party beneficiaries—namely, the people of Jammu and Kashmir—it cannot, I submit, be changed or modified even by the Security Council, far less repudiated by one of the parties.

This is the position of Pakistan. In surrendering it, Pakistan would surrender not only a basic principle of its national policy but the very

principle of its allegiance to the United Nations.

I can pledge from this rostrum that my Government intends no such surrender.

The third issue which is involved in the Jammu and Kashmir dispute is that of the effectiveness of the United Nations for the pacific settlement of international disputes.

To all those who put their faith in international peace-making, it should be a cause for concern that this dispute has remained unresolved not only because of India's intransigence but also because of the failure of the Security Council to overcome that intransigence. The history of the dispute is a history of opportunities neglected, of chances thrown away, of warnings disdained.

Since 1949, Pakistan has repeatedly approached the Security Council. Every time we asked, not for a verdict in our favour or against India, but for the Council to spell out the obligations of the parties under the international agreement. Every time we warned that the issue involved the questions of war or peace in the sub-continent. Every time we were ignored.

Ever since it had become plain to the Commission that India was determined to block the demilitarization of Kashmir and to prevent the plebiscite, there was no lack of opportunities for the Security Council to discharge its primary responsibility. When the Commission reported its failure, the Security Council should have realised the futility of further negotiations and should have called upon the two parties to fulfil their obligations. It did not do so. When the Commission suggested that the differences between the two Governments with regard to their obligations for demilitarization should be submitted to arbitration, President Truman of the United States and Prime Minister Attlee of the United Kingdom endorsed that suggestion and Pakistan accepted it. At that point too, the Security Council had an opportunity to support the appeals of the United States and the United Kingdom and to bring pressure to bear upon India to accept it. Again this was not done.

When Sir Owen Dixon, who replaced the United Nations Commission, reported that he could not make India agree to withdraw its troops from Kashmir and allow the people of the State freely to decide their future, it had become manifestly clear that India was no longer acting in good faith, and mere persuasion was no longer enough. Again, the Council refused to grasp the nettle. Again, it put its faith in further mediatory efforts, this time by Dr. Frank P. Graham.

When, after persevering efforts over a period of years, Mr. Graham made a clear report in 1958 about Pakistan's acceptance of his proposals and India's rejection of them, again the Security Council did nothing. It will be interesting to those Members of the Assembly who do not know

it that, in the past seven years, the Security Council has not found time even to consider Mr. Graham's report.

At each stage, India went one step further in defiance of the international agreement. The Security Council, instead of discharging its duty under the Charter, continuously yielded to India's manoeuvres until India became convinced that it could defy the Council with impunity. By letting that situation arise, the Council abdicated its functions under the Charter. This had a far-reaching effect. It jeopardized peace in our region. It gave rise to grave doubts whether the United Nations was capable of securing the implementation of an agreement which it had itself brought about. It brought the peace-keeping functions of the United Nations into disrepute.

Having manoeuvred the Security Council into a position of helplessness, India openly repudiated its obligations under the United Nations resolutions. The Council merely watched a process of continuous attrition. Since 1962, it found it difficult even to pass a resolution asking for the parties to negotiate with due regard to their commitments. It was not a question of imposing a solution on one party to a dispute. It was a question of securing India's compliance with the agreement which it had freely and solemnly entered into. And thus the world witnessed the pitiful inadequacy of the principal organ of the United Nations for the maintenance of international peace and security.

It is a painful story, this story of the Security Council's inaction. The world knows how all avenues leading to a peaceful settlement of the dispute —the recognized methods of negotiation, mediation and arbitration— were blocked by India. For no reason understandable in terms of the Charter, this inhibited the Council, instead of stimulating it into action. It is no secret that in 1964, when there was a mass uprising in Jammu and Kashmir, the Council met only reluctantly. A distinguished representative at that time said to us that we had brought a "dead horse" to the Council. Another expressed the opinion that we were using the Council for internal propaganda. I put it to the members of this Assembly: Could any situation be more exasperating for a country which is a party to an international dispute? Here was a question in which not only Pakistan was deeply and vitally interested. Here was a question which was also a matter of life and death for the five million people of Jammu and Kashmir. Here was a question which involved the peace and stability of Asia. But the Council was content with meeting, hearing parties and adjourning *sine die*.

When, through the years, we warned the Security Council that the problem should be resolved before it led to an explosion, our warnings either went unheeded or were termed an empty threat. I again ask the Members of the Assembly : What language is one supposed to speak when one wants

to bring out the urgency of a situation and the grave dangers in its remaining unresolved? Pakistan spoke that language. It spoke the language of reason and remonstrance, it made constructive proposals such as the induction of a United Nations force pending a plebiscite. But nothing made India budge an inch. Nothing moved the primary organ of the United Nations into action.

Such was the position in the Security Council. Outside the Council, from 1949 to this day, India has spurned every offer, rejected every suggestion, barred every avenue for the peaceful settlement of the dispute. It has ruled out recourse to the International Court of Justice. It has rejected mediation, conciliation and even good offices, including those of the Secretary-General. Whenever India has made a show of willingness to enter into bilateral negotiations with Pakistan, it has been only to tide over some crisis in its internal or foreign relations. In the long negotiations in 1962 and 1963, during the Sino-Indian conflict, India's position was that it would retain the possession of Kashmir, which it had obtained by force, and all there was to negotiate was how best to establish it in that possession. Finally, India's real attitude was made clear by its Home Minister on 1 July 1965, when he stated:

> "Kashmir is an integral part of India. It is a settled fact which cannot be the subject of debate or negotiations."

Such a declaration foreclosed the pacific settlement of the dispute. India brazenly sought to annex the State of Jammu and Kashmir in 1964. Concurrently, for the third time, Sheikh Abdullah, the Lion of Kashmir, was thrown into prison in 1965 by the Indian Government.

What was the result? The result was that the tensions which had been accumulating through the years exploded, and a situation arose precisely of the kind about which we had warned the Security Council and the world for over a decade. The people of Jammu and Kashmir could no longer be content with a non-violent rebellion and were forced to take to arms, which eventually led to war between India and Pakistan, one of the gravest situations ever faced by the United Nations.

In view of the background of this dispute, we are certain that both the United Nations and Pakistan, as a Member of the United Nations, have arrived at the crossroads. For the United Nations, there are two paths open. One is to continue to condone further evasions by India, to succumb to the pressures of power politics, and to foreclose the chances of a just and enduring peace between India and Pakistan. The other is to take prompt measures to secure a just and honourable settlement of the Jammu and Kashmir dispute and to save India and Pakistan from another catastrophe. Need I say that the fear and misery in both countries, the grief and suffering endured, the blood that has been shed, all cry out for an immediate

settlement of the dispute on the only basis on which it can be finally settled: the basis of the will of the people of Jammu and Kashmir.

It is upon the path chosen by the United Nations that Pakistan's course will itself depend. If the United Nations works for a settlement, not on our terms, but in terms of the Charter, in terms of the international agreement accepted by both parties, then Pakistan will not stint its co-operation in the slightest measure. If, however, delays still prevail, if the expediencies of power politics rule the day, then Pakistan will be forced to conclude that the norms and purposes of the Charter and the actual practice of the political organs of the United Nations are no longer in harmony. The choice that will then be forced upon us will be the choice between a principle and a pledge, on the one side, and the dictates of power, on the other. It will be painful, but it will involve no dilemma. Pakistan will opt for the principles of the Charter rather than for the expediencies of this Organization. I have every confidence that, when we say that we might have to withdraw from this Organization, our fellow Member States will not consider this to be a threat or ultimatum by Pakistan, but the outcome of deep and long disillusionment over its ineffectiveness to resolve a dispute which has been a threat to world peace, just because one Member State, India, which holds an excessive number of sensitive posts in the Secretariat of the United Nations, refuses to honour its commitments.

Pakistan will never presume to dictate to the Security Council. But our fellow Members will appreciate that, when faced by a situation of the extreme nature of the one which confronts Pakistan today, a country has to ask itself some fundamental questions. One of these questions is: What kind of peace do we seek? The second question is: What kind of peace is it that the United Nations assures for its Members?

The United Nations Charter could not be clearer on the subject. Article 2, paragraph 3, makes it binding on Members to settle their international disputes by peaceful means in such a manner that international security and justice are not endangered. The point here is the conjunction of peace and justice. There are some who separate the two—who, in other words, elect, or want others to elect, peace at any price. But peace at any price is not the purpose of this Organization. Peace at any price could be achieved without this Organization. The United Nations came into being as the result of a war waged against aggressors. If that war had not been waged—if the peoples of Britain, France, the Soviet Union and the United States, and the resistance movements in Europe and other parts of the world had not fought against fascism—we still would have had a peace imposed by a victorious aggressor. But it would have been a dark, evil, iniquitous peace. It would not have been the peace envisaged in the United Nations Charter.

To impose an unjust peace on a Member of the United Nations is, there-

fore, to undermine the Charter. The very purpose of the United Nations, as laid down in Article 1 of the Charter, is completely disregarded when a country is enjoined to "live with" a problem, rather than make vigorous efforts for its resolution. A sophisticated expression of this trend has been the formulation of what is called the law of the cease-fire. This so-called law is nothing but a justification, a rationalization, for doing nothing to settle disputes, especially those which involve the life and future of millions of human beings.

The more one analyzes it, the more it seems to be but an expression of the philosophy of the *status quo*. This was the philosophy that brought death and dishonour to the League of Nations. It is the philosophy of those nations which are secure in their possessions and resources and have the ability to enforce their will upon others. It is not, and cannot be, the philosophy of those who have been robbed of their rights, who have suffered infringements and who cannot be expected to tolerate the *status quo*. Justice sometimes demands a change in it.

The test of the United Nations lies in whether it can ensure that this change will be peaceful and will conform to human justice. If it does not stand the test, the conclusion will be unavoidable that it is a monopoly of the "haves" and that it cannot adjust itself to dynamic currents of international life based on justice and honour.

Mr. President, you are aware of the very grave situation prevailing in India and Pakistan today. If the root cause of the conflict is not removed, it would be dishonest for anyone to suggest that the cease-fire in any way mitigates the dangers that lie ahead.

It is no use to have the Security Council congratulate itself on the accomplishment of the cease-fire. Will it be any consolation to any one that the United Nations has an observer corps merely to observe and report violations of the cease-fire? A cease-fire and its observation do not amount to peace. What is needed is firm action to eradicate the incentives to violence and fighting. What is needed is action to remove the seeds of war.

Pakistan has accepted the call for the cease-fire with the confidence that it would lead, not to mere exhortations and appeals, but to a self-executing machinery for a final settlement of the Kashmir dispute. Security Council resolution 211 of 20 September 1965 has described the cease-fire as "a first step towards a peaceful settlement of the outstanding differences between the two countries on Kashmir and other related matters." As far as we are concerned, there are no "other related matters"; there is only the Kashmir dispute between us. There is nothing in this resolution which precludes the implementation of the UNCIP resolutions which have been the sole point of agreement between the parties and which alone can ensure an enduring settlement. If anything is plain in this resolution, it is that the cease-fire

should not lead to the spurious and bullet-riddled peace which has been the lot of both India and Pakistan for all these years.

Pakistan believes that the Security Council and the Assembly will not allow the spirit of this resolution again to be eroded. We have made proposals, and I will leave it to the judgement of Members of this Organization whether our proposals are just and fair. It is no use telling us that India does not accept them. If they are just and fair, and are the only ones that make a reference to the will of the people, then it is for this Organization and the world at large to make India accept them.

Indeed, India's objections to these proposals follow the same pattern as that of the variety of pretexts which it has put forward for depriving the people of Jammu and Kashmir of their right to decide their future.

Today I present the following proposal. Let both countries withdraw their forces from the State of Jammu and Kashmir. Let the United Nations send a force consisting of contingents from African, Asian and Latin American countries, countries which have no interest in the outcome of the plebiscite in Kashmir and which are not involved in the exigencies of international power politics.

India has given the stock answer that it will not accept "foreign" troops on Indian soil. The State of Jammu and Kashmir is not a part of India; that is precisely the point at issue. But what passes comprehension is that India which has sent its own troops to serve in United Nations forces in other countries, which has deputed one of its Generals as the Chief Military Adviser to the Secretary-General for many long years, which has pretensions to the leadership of the Afro-Asian community and seeks hegemony over the Indian Ocean region, should consider that the stationing of a United Nations force in Kashmir, composed of African, Asian and Latin American contingents, would constitute a "foreign" intrusion and an affront to the honour of India.

If we had made the demand that Kashmir be given to us, the United Nations would have every right to look askance at our suggestion. We are asking that a plebiscite—the most orderly, peaceful and equitable method for the solution of the problem—be held within a reasonable period. Those who read "Kashmir" for "plebiscite" and consider our demand unreasonable admit, in effect, that if Kashmir is given the chance to decide its fate, it will link its destiny with Pakistan.

This is the reality of the Jammu and Kashmir dispute. This is the primary fact of the present situation between India and Pakistan. For eighteen years this dispute has been before the United Nations. For eighteen years it has been the victim of apathy and inertia. At times it has been caught in the coils of the cold war. While the human core of the dispute might have been obscured from other eyes; it could not be eclipsed in Pakistan eyes. The

suffering of the people of Jammu and Kashmir, their being sundered from their brethren in Pakistan, their families divided, their hopes deferred, their voice unheard—these could not but weigh heavily on the conscience and feelings of the hundred million people of Pakistan.

When Pakistan, a country much smaller than India, was invaded by India, the sufferings of both Pakistan and Jammu and Kashmir were fused. These sufferings formed a single resolve to fight against India's aggression against Pakistan and Kashmir. These passions may be disregarded in the calculations of power politics, but history deals far more justly with them. When we say that we are giving the United Nations a last chance to settle the Jammu and Kashmir dispute, we are saying that we are determined not to let a righteous cause be abandoned. It is not the will of Allah that the victims of injustice and aggression should have no higher court of appeal.

Address to the Thirteen Hundred and Sixty-Fourth Plenary Meeting of the United Nations General Assembly on October 15, 1965

I apologize for taking the rostrum again on the question of Jammu and Kashmir. We have discussed it at great length, but it becomes necessary for me to take the rostrum again because of the remarkable, almost magnificent, distortion of facts which the Assembly has just heard from the heirs of those who were the first to be the champions of the literature of fairy tales and of distortion.

The representative of India, who took the floor just now, has outdone that great legacy of fiction. This performance of his this afternoon has been better than the rope trick. He has referred to Pakistan's aggression, saying that in eighteen years it has committed aggression against India on three occasions. Pakistan is a small state. We are much smaller than India in our resources, in our population, in our ability. It is preposterous for anyone to contend, after an objective appreciation of all the realities, that Pakistan would be given to aggression against a powerful and large neighbour like India. All that we have done in the last eighteen years has been to uphold our national sovereignty, to uphold the cause of justice, and to uphold a righteous course; and if, in so doing, we have been pitted against a merciless neighbour, a neighbour that has itself been given to aggression, whose policy is predicated and based on aggression, it is because we believe that a smaller people, a smaller country can withstand the slaughter and the aggression of a greater neighbour in the course of upholding principles and international morality. We have been accused of committing aggression against a country which is five times our size; a country which in eighteen years has an exemplary record of aggression; a country that has committed aggression against Junagadh, Manavadar, and Mangrol, against Hyderabad, against the State

of Kashmir; a country which is responsible for the Sino-Indian conflict and which also seized Goa by force.

We do not condone imperialism. We do not say that there should be any vestiges of imperialism left anywhere in the world. On the contrary it is our very cause, our very contention, that we want to see the liquidation of all forms of colonialism; and that is why with all our resources and all our strength we are upholding the cause of the people of the State of Kashmir. It is not that we condone imperialism; it is that we condemn the methods India chooses in the settlement of disputes. The representative of India says that Pakistan has violated the United Nations Charter in upholding the cause of the people of Jammu and Kashmir. I ask you, Mr. President and fellow delegates: Who has violated the United Nations Charter? What has been Pakistan's position? All that Pakistan has sought is the implementation of the United Nations resolutions and adherence to the United Nations Charter. It is we who, for the past eighteen years, have sought sedulously and tirelessly to implement the United Nations resolutions and the United Nations Charter. It is we who have asked India to implement the very resolution of the United Nations to which India is a party. That is all we ask. We ask that India, representing 400 million people and claiming to be the largest democracy in the world, should honour the solemn pledge which she gave in broad daylight in the United Nations of her free will and of her free accord. Not only did she give it here in the United Nations in 1948 and 1949, but that pledge—that the people of Jammu and Kashmir will exercise their right to self-determination—was given by the Prime Minister of India, Jawaharlal Nehru, repeatedly to the people of Pakistan and to the people of Jammu and Kashmir. All we seek is that India should fulfil her solemn commitments; yet India has the temerity to say that it is Pakistan that has violated the United Nations Charter. It is we who seek to uphold the Charter of the United Nations and to strengthen this international organization by pressing for compelling India to abide by its Charter and resolutions and to fulfil her commitment to Pakistan, to the people of Kashmir and to the United Nations.

The representative of India has referred to a so-called acknowledged leader of Kashmir and a co-worker of Shaikh Abdullah, who took the floor a few days ago from this rostrum—a man called Mir Qasim. He has been described as a co-worker of Shaikh Abdullah. But who is Shaikh Abdullah? Shaikh Abdullah is the Lion of Kashmir; the man who has waged a heroic struggle for the people of Jammu and Kashmir from 1931 onwards; the man who has been prepared to make any sacrifice for a righteous cause; the man who was regarded by Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru as the champion of the people of Kashmir, as a heroic legend whose fame and glory knew no dimensions of territory, as a person who was a hero and a symbol of his people, as a

person who symbolized freedom and the struggle for emancipation. These are not my words. These are the words of Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru, paraphrased by me, which are in the records of the United Nations. Yet that great hero, who symbolized freedom, is today in an Indian gaol. By proxy we are told what Shaikh Abdullah said, what Shaikh Abdullah meant; and the Indian representative has the audacity to quote a man who, in the eighteen years of our independence, has been incarcerated for eleven years or more by India. After the independence of India, this great comrade of Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru, this great symbol of the freedom movement, has been rotting in Indian gaols for more than a decade. When his son, the young Tariq Abdullah, who is a chip off the old block and a valiant fighter who has inherited the great tradition of his father and his people, takes this rostrum, he is ridiculed. In ridiculing Tariq Abdullah, the Indian representative is actually ridiculing Shaikh Abdullah. They have cause for ridiculing him, because it is that same Shaikh Abdullah who now languishes and rots in Indian gaols. We say: Release Shaikh Abdullah, the acknowledged leader of the people of Jammu and Kashmir, and let the world hear what he has to say about the future of the State of Jammu and Kashmir.

Yesterday, when Tariq Abdullah, took the floor, he did say that, originally, Shaikh Abdullah, who had been given solemn pledges and assurances by the Government of India and by the Prime Minister of India that a plebiscite would be held in the State of Jammu and Kashmir, took those assurances at their face value. He believed them because they came from a Prime Minister of the largest democracy in the world—from Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru. In view of those solemn and categorical assurances, he did co-operate with the Indian Government, but on condition that a plebiscite would be held in the State of Jammu and Kashmir to determine the future of the people of that State. However, when time and experience showed that all the Indian Government meant was to perpetrate a fraud on the people of Jammu and Kashmir, he was disillusioned. This was not the first time in history that leaders of a people have been ensnared, entrapped and deluded. Thus, when Tariq Abdullah took the floor, he said:

"This will give the Assembly some idea of the causes of my father's disillusionment with India. For a man who had been a staunch nationalist all his life, a personal friend of Pandit Nehru, who condemned bigotry and fanaticism, and under whose leadership Kashmir remained untainted with any religious strife, it could not be but a wrench and a deep crisis to arise the banner of revolt against Indian occupation of Kashmir. Much though he loved the principles of secularism, he could not tolerate that, under their cloak, India should throttle the aspirations of the people of Kashmir, separate them from their brethren in Pakistan and hold them in bondage. He warned Mr. Nehru from 1952 onwards

that India was following a disastrous policy in Kashmir, and that, if she reneged on the promise of a fair and impartial plebiscite, she would forfeit all claims to the respect and sympathy of the people of Kashmir as well as the people of the world. When in 1953 he publicly stated his view that the future of India, Pakistan and Kashmir could not be secure without an honourable settlement of the Kashmir dispute, he was deposed and put in gaol. For a long time no legal proceedings were brought against him. When a case was filed, it dragged on for several years. Finally, Shaikh Abdullah was acquitted in 1964, but his freedom was short-lived. Since early this year he has been kept in detention without trial."

So this is the truth about Shaikh Abdullah who now languishes in an Indian gaol, and who is being authoritatively quoted as representing the Kashmir position in so far as India is concerned. Yet when the authentic voice of the people of Kashmir, represented by Tariq Abdullah, takes this rostrum we are told by the Indian representative that what he utters is not true.

Let us see what Shaikh Abdullah has to say more recently. The Indian representative has quoted Shaikh Abdullah in 1947, in 1948, in 1950, when, under categorical assurances given by the Government of India, he made certain statements which would, later on, betray and belie him and which, though no longer of any relevance, are now being quoted to the Assembly.

But let us see the actual position, as it is today. The thinking of Shaikh Abdullah, as revealed in February 1958, is this:

"Since my release, after four and a half years of detention, I have tried to explain my viewpoint and possible solutions in regard to various problems facing the political future of the State. With sufficient clarity, I hope, I have succeeded in elucidating the following principles: (a) So long as a final decision about the future disposition of Jammu and Kashmir state is not arrived at, the political uncertainty, the economic distress and the miseries which the people of the state are facing at present cannot terminate; (b) The existing strained relations between India and Pakistan are not only a source of great danger to the solidarity of Asia but also threaten the ruin of the people of the state of Jammu and Kashmir; the dispute over Kashmir is one of the main contributing factors to these strained relations; and (c) The ultimate decision with regard to the future affiliation of the state rests with the people and can only be achieved by allowing them to exercise their right to self-determination under impartial international supervision in accordance with the universally recognized methods —as has already been agreed to by the parties concerned—or otherwise as is acceptable to them."

Again, Shaikh Abdullah, addressing 20,000 people in Jammu on 9 April 1964—not 1948 or 1949—declared emphatically that it would be wrong

to claim that the people of Jammu and Kashmir had already exercised their right of self-determination through free general elections, when the truth was that all three elections held had been rigged. This charge was made, he said, not only by him but also by all opposition parties in Jammu and Kashmir, including the Jan Sangh, an extremist Hindu organization.

In addition, on 15 April 1964, speaking in Doda, a town in Jammu, Shaikh Abdullah said that the argument that the people of Kashmir had exercised their right of self-determination by electing a constituent assembly was beside the point, because no election was held on the issue of accession. He added that the elections were rigged, even according to the Prime Minister of the State of Jammu and Kashmir, Mr. G.M. Sadiq, when he made a certain reference to those elections which I shall not take up the members' time to repeat here now.

Again, on 13 March 1965, speaking at Nottingham, Shaikh Abdullah said:

> "When we went to the Security Council it was decided that the question of Kashmir would be settled through a free and impartial plebiscite. Suddenly we started feeling that India's opinion was changing. India was going back on her word. India wanted me to support her on this and it is from here that my quarrel with India started. We have no enmity with anyone. We only want to exercise our right. Once that right is achieved, I would have no objection if the people freely join this country or that, but whichever course they adopt it will be an honourable course. They will not be driven like cattle."

This was in Nottingham, on 13 March 1965, when Shaikh Abdullah was briefly released from gaol and was again imprisoned upon his return to India.

The representative of India has said that he does not want to waste the time of this Assembly by repeating all the arguments. None of us wish to waste the time of this Assembly but much more is at stake than the time of this Assembly, much, much more is at stake. The principles of the United Nations are at stake. The principle of self-determination is at stake. The causes of war and of peace are at stake, and it is necessary to speak out on these issues, because these issues have a bearing on the future of humanity. And it is the direct responsibility of this Assembly not only to hear them but also to resolve these disputes which lead to the slaughter of mankind, to bloodshed and to misery. So it is not a question of wasting the time of this Assembly. It is a question of bringing before this Assembly matters of dire importance which affect the peace in our region and which affect the future of our countries.

The representative of India has said that legally, morally and constitutionally the State of Jammu and Kashmir is a part of India. Shaikh Abdullah

and many of us before that have informed the Assembly of the legal, moral and political issues involved in the future determination of the people of Jammu and Kashmir. It has been said in defence of the Indian contention that no uprising has ever taken place and that at present there were only infiltrators who went in from Pakistan to be of assistance to the people of Jammu and Kashmir. And, in support of this contention, *The New York Times* has been quoted, authoritatively. I have here before me the most recent report from *The New York Times,* if that is an authoritative way of determining the future of the people of Jammu and Kashmir. On 13 October, *The New York Times* says: "Police in Kashmir kill boys; stoning by crowd is charged", and there follows a long report of what is happening in Srinagar, how students are being killed, how demonstrations are being quelled, how popular uprisings are being quashed by the 200,000 Indian soldiers who are in the valley, and all this has increased since the fighting is taking place between India and Pakistan. The police forces and the militia of the state are all pitted against the poor, helpless, innocent people of Jammu and Kashmir.

Again, on 14 October 1965 there is another report from Jammu and Kashmir by the correspondent of *The New York Times.* He says: "School girls lead Kashmir crusade; hatred of India draws them out of cloistered life". So the young school girls of the age of eighteen and younger have taken upon themselves the struggle with their comrades for the liberation of the people of Jammu and Kashmir.

These are facts; these are realities which cannot be ignored. There are demonstrations—we want plebiscite; long live Pakistan; long live the struggle of the people of Jammu and Kashmir—by young students, by mujahids, by freedom fighters, by the five million people of Jammu and Kashmir, all united indissolubly and indivisibly for a fight, for a just cause which cannot be denied to them. It is a righteous cause. They may be pitted against Indian bayonets; they may be pitted against the force, the might and the armada of the Indian army; but their sacrifices will not be in vain. The blood that they shed will not be in vain.

We are told that it were the freedom fighters who destroyed and looted and committed arson in Jammu and Kashmir. It is inconceivable for a people to commit aggression against their own people. It is inconceivable for the people of Jammu and Kashmir to perpetrate wrongs against their own brethren. When the *Pakistan Times* was quoted with reference to the burning of Patmulla village it was not the *Pakistan Times.* The *Pakistan Times* was quoting the All India Radio, and it reported the All India Radio to have said that the village of Patmulla had been razed to the ground. I believe that Mr. Radhakrishnan, the President of India, visited Patmulla and saw for himself the destruction of that village; the burning of innocent

men, women and children, and I believe even he wept. I am told that Mr. Desai, a former Finance Minister of India, when he was told that Indian soldiers and the Indian army had committed genocide and had burned villages, he said, in defence of that action, "Well, if someone from Madras wanted to secede from India, I would not mind if villages in Madras were burned."

However, the question of Madras or the question of any other constituent part of India has no relevance whatsoever to Kashmir. Kashmir has never been a part of India. Kashmir's future has always been in dispute. I do not say this. This is what India has said. This is what India has maintained *i.e.* the future of the state of Jammu and Kashmir will be decided by the people of Jammu and Kashmir. Kashmir is not a part of India. It can never be a part of India. It has never been a part of India. We have no quarrel with India, properly calling with an Indian India; but Kashmir is not an Indian India.

This is not my assertion. These are the assertions, the pledges and the commitments of the Government of India itself, and in the space of eighteen years they cannot be forgotten. They can never be forgotten as long as the conscience of mankind exists, as long as there is civilization, and as long as there is a quest for freedom of peoples.

Pakistan is also a pluralistic society. We also have multi-racial and multi-lingual components of Pakistan. We have the Baluchi, the Sindhi, the Pathans, the Punjabi and the Bengali. We would not like to see fissiparous tendencies encouraged in India. We would not like to see the disintegration of India. This process of disintegration can be harmful, not only to India, but to its neighbours. We would like to see a strong India. We would like to see a consolidated India, a harmonious and peaceful India, but that India must be Indian India. That India must be a part of India, and not a disputed territory which has been taken by India by brute force and occupied by the imposition of its army and the bayonets.

It has been said that in Pakistan we are holding various nationalities by force, and reference has been made to certain regions of Pakistan. This is a problem of the people of Pakistan, and if there is any dispute which Pakistan may have with others it is none of India's concern. Our relations with Afghanistan are most cordial. During the war with India, I know for certain where the sympathies of the people of Afghanistan lay, as demonstrated by the people of Afghanistan and reiterated by the Government of Afghanistan.

The King of Afghanistan, in a communique to my President, said: I as a King give you assurance, I as a Muslim give you assurance, I as an Afghan give you assurance that we are with you, and we will never betray you.

It is none of India's concern to meddle in Pakistan's internal affairs. We would not want to meddle in India's internal affairs. By resorting to a

just settlement of the dispute over Jammu and Kashmir we are not interfering in India's internal affairs, because the problem of Jammu and Kashmir is not a question of India's internal affairs. It is a question of India fulfilling her pledge to the people of Jammu and Kashmir, and it is a question, pure and simple, of the exercise of their right to self-determination.

It has been said by the representative of India that the problem is of a much greater dimension, that the problem does not concern Kashmir alone. It is one of religious bigotry. It is one of intolerance.

Pakistan has friendly relations with all its neighbours, except, unfortunately, India, and that is not because of any failing on the part of Pakistan. We have friendly relations with Nepal which is a Hindu state. The majority of the people of Nepal belong to the great Hindu religion. We have over ten million Hindus in Pakistan and they have lived in peace. Their lives, property and honour have never been jeopardized. We have hardly had any communal disturbances, whereas in India, secular India, they have had over 600-odd communal disturbances. Even during this war they had communal disturbances in which minorities were maltreated.

The representative of India contradicts himself when he says that the Muslims of India fought valiantly for India during the struggle against Pakistan; that they were amongst the highest decorated soldiers. I bear tribute to their valour. I bear tribute to all the soldiers of India who fought heroically in this war, but does this not show that our dispute with India is not a religious dispute? That it is not a communal dispute? It is a national dispute. It is a dispute over principles. It is a dispute over the right to self-determination. It is a dispute over the implementation of international agreements. If it were a religious dispute, if it had to deal with the determination of a communal future, then why should the Indian Muslims have fought so valiantly and so bravely?

But because it is not a communal dispute, because it has nothing to do with religion, the Indian Muslims—as they rightly should do, according to their great tradition and according to their great religion—fight for their motherland, and we salute their bravery, whether they be Indian, whether they be Muslims, Hindus or Christians. So also those who fought for Pakistan, whether they be Muslims, Hindus, Christians or Buddhists, fought for their motherland. They fought against a predatory aggressor and that is why it is not a religious issue. It has nothing to do with religion. It has nothing to do with bigotry. It has to do with the most sublime and the most liberal principles which have been upheld by mankind, that is, the future of a people, their liberty, their freedom, an international obligation, an international commitment. These are the principles for which Pakistan has fought, and not on the basis of religion or communalism, which the representative of India, himself, by contradicting himself, has established for Pakistan.

The dispute over Jammu and Kashmir transcends not only religious frontiers, but also national frontiers. This dispute is not only the concern of India and Pakistan and the people of Jammu and Kashmir. It is the concern of the United Nations. It is the concern of the international community. Just as the international community has supported the freedom movements throughout the world, wherever they be, whether in Asia, Africa or in any other part of the world, it is its moral obligation to support the freedom movement of the people of Jammu and Kashmir.

We are not fanatics, we are not bigots. We want peace in order to develop ourselves, in order to give a better life to our people, in order to make progress so that, after centuries of misery, after centuries of poverty, we can march forward. We should also progress and have a better life. This is our concern and our ambition, and we want the whole international community to march side by side with us in the determination of these high objectives.

But in life, men have fought for honour, men have fought for self-respect, men have fought for pledges and for nations. They may be small. Their resources may be limited. They may be subjected to one aggression after another. They may face overwhelming obstacles. They may face overwhelming odds. But finally they must triumph.

It is our conviction, it is our belief in God, it is our belief in international morality and in the conscience of mankind that the people of Jammu and Kashmir shall not be an exception to this long and glorious march of mankind for justice, for peace and for honour, and as far as Pakistan is concerned, it is pledged, it is honour-bound to fulfil this promise to the people of Jammu and Kashmir. We shall never tire. We shall never rest. We shall continue relentlessly and dauntlessly for the achievement of the right to self-determination for the people of Jammu and Kashmir, and for the fulfilment of international obligations entered into solemnly by sovereign states and sanctified and baptized by the United Nations. This is our right and this we shall fight for, irrespective of the consequences.

Address to the Fifteen Hundred and Forty-First Meeting of the Fourth Committee of the United Nations General Assembly on October 28, 1965

Mr. Chairman,

May I take this opportunity to offer to you my personal congratulations on your election to the Chairmanship of the Fourth Committee. Your association over many years with this Committee is well known and will enable the Committee to benefit from your intimate knowledge of the problems with which it deals. For my country, it is a matter of special gratification to see in the Chair the distinguished national of a country with which our relations are more than those of good neighbourliness and friendship. The fraternal ties, Sir, that bind the peoples of Iran and Pakistan need no emphasis.

Mr. Chairman, the problem which today occupies the attention of the Fourth Committee is one which has been before it now for several years. While the classic form of colonialism has waned, the more subtle forms of domination of one people by another, of attempts by privileged minorities to perpetuate their rule over the indigenous inhabitants, represents the remnant and ultimate citadel of the injustice and wrong-doing that is associated with the history of colonialism. The case of Southern Rhodesia falls in this category and ever since the regime which today rules the country came to power on the basis of a restricted and loaded franchise, the situation has assumed an increasingly grave aspect. We are today confronted with a situation in which a headstrong minority is determined, in defiance of world opinion and heedless of consequences, to declare its so-called "independence". The "independence" which the band of desperate men who constitute the Government of Southern Rhodesia are determined to snatch will be no independence but the consolidation of the rule of an alien minority, a phenomenon of grotesque racial discrimination. In short, this world

organization is faced with the prospect of another regime based on apartheid. It is evident that we cannot and shall not permit the creation of another South Africa in our midst. It is for this reason that my delegation co-sponsored the resolution which was adopted some days ago by the General Assembly and is again co-sponsoring the present resolution which calls for firm and courageous action to thwart this monstrous scheme.

Mr. Chairman, we have joined resolutely in co-sponsoring a resolution which calls upon the administering power to take a series of measures which would lead to an amelioration of the situation and open the way for a settlement of the question of Southern Rhodesia. We note in particular the declared policy of the United Kingdom Government not to recognize any unilateral declaration of independence by the recalcitrants of Salisbury. The force of this declaration has been augmented by similar declarations of intent by a number of Western Powers, not the least being the United States of America. Nevertheless, it is our opinion that in view of the stand adopted by them up to the present, not much confidence can be placed in the capacity of the ruling coterie of Southern Rhodesia or even to make a rational assessment of the consequences which, by their short-sighted and illegal actions, they threaten to bring not only on their own heads but on Africa as a whole. It is to be borne in mind in particular that Southern Rhodesia is surrounded by territories with whose rulers they share an affinity of views and from whom, for that reason, they may be encouraged to expect moral and material support. Nothing would be more dangerous than that the present regime in Southern Rhodesia should be encouraged in their vain and dangerous hopes.

I have no wish, Mr. Chairman, to underestimate the difficulty which the United Kingdom Government face in their attempts to make Mr. Ian Smith and his colleagues see reason. The fact, however, that persuasion and remonstrance have failed to have the desired effect is no reason to allow matters to drift any longer. Mr. Smith's own recent statements show that matters are rapidly coming to a head. We would submit that the time for patience is now past and it is for the United Kingdom, which in its capacity as the administering Power is responsible before this world body for the welfare and emancipation of the people of the Territory, to recognize its responsibilities and act in full discharge of them. We welcome, as a step in the right direction, the British Government's indication that they would apply economic sanctions against Southern Rhodesia if its minority rulers proceed to declare its independence. It may be questioned, however, if it is not already too late for this threat to have its effect and whether more direct methods of coercion may not have become necessary. This is not an easy choice for the United Kingdom Government as the people whom she has to restrain and, if necessary, to act against are of her own kith and kin. They are descendants of the people who colonized the Territory in the hey-day of imperialism, when

it seemed that the sun would never cease to shine on the Empire and that for ever, as one of them expressed it, the association between the two races would be that of a rider and horse. Many of these people have made Southern Rhodesia their home and indeed they know of no other homeland. Yet they are not prepared to live there as citizens of the land of their adoption, co-operating to mutual advantage with those for whom this land is the land of their forefathers. In other territories of Africa, whose nations sit here as representatives of free countries, men of many races, including those belonging to the former colonial powers, live in peace and harmony, working together to remake the long oppressed African continent in a new image. If the alien minority of Southern Rhodesia will live there either as masters or not at all, then the choice is theirs to make. It is late in the day already but perhaps not too late yet for them to make history and recognize that the day of racial superiority is over in Africa.

It is our earnest hope, in co-sponsoring the present resolution, that the very great influence and power, which the United Kingdom can exercise over the handful of men who have set themselves against the gaining of justice in the current world opinion, will be exercised to avert the crisis which must inescapably follow any rash action by the men of Salisbury.

It is my belief that the Government of the United Kingdom will be failing in their duty as the administering Power and will be going counter to their own hitherto creditable record as an enlightened colonial Power if in the face of the peculiar difficulties presented by the problem of Southern Rhodesia they were to take cover behind arguments of a legalistic nature to avoid taking difficult and perhaps domestically unpopular decision. None the less it is necessary to recall that the Constitution under which the present minority group has come to power is one which was given to the colony by the Government of the United Kingdom. This Constitution can and must be abrogated as a first step towards allowing all the people of Southern Rhodesia their inalienable and inherent right to be masters in their own home.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to draw the attention of this meeting to the statement on Southern Rhodesia issued by the President of Pakistan on 15 October 1965 which sets out in clear terms the position of my Government on this issue:

> "The Government of Pakistan have received with deep concern news of the failure of the recent talks on Rhodesia held in London and the threatened unilateral Declaration of Independence by the present minority Government of Rhodesia. A resort to Declaration of Independence by the present Government of Rhodesia would be clear evidence of a design to establish white minority rule over the African population of Rhodesia. The Government of Pakistan strongly condemn this crude attempt at racial domination. The Rhodesian Government must know

that the Afro-Asian Community would never tolerate it and the consequences of the course on which it is bent could be disastrous. The Government of Pakistan fully support the just aspirations of the African people of Rhodesia for self-determination and consider that this British colony can achieve independence only on the basis of majority rule.

A unilateral declaration of independence by the Government of Rhodesia in order to perpetuate white minority rule over the African population can have no validity whatsoever and the Government of Pakistan will never recognize it."

Mr. Chairman, it is our conviction that the most essential prerequisite of a lasting peace and a civilized world order is the termination of the remaining vestiges of subjugation and domination. The most important achievement of our contemporary times is our progress towards freedom and equality. These are cardinal objectives of vital importance to the future of mankind. They are inseparable and indivisible. The forcible denial of the legitimate rights and aspirations of human beings in the African continent is not just a political or moral issue as such. It is more than that. It is a human problem. A problem which is of immediate concern to us in Asia who are struggling valiantly against remnants of the forces of domination which have stifled our growth and suffocated our existence for so long.

We believe, most profoundly, that the reprehensible attitude of the Rhodesian Government, whose objective is to perpetuate the domination of a few over the many on the basis of the difference in the colour of their skins or their faith, is directed not only against the people of Rhodesia but against the hopes and aspirations of the countless millions of humanity in Africa and Asia. This we are determined to prevent by every possible means at our disposal. If the world is to move from conflicts between colonial interests and conflicts between different ideologies to a conflict between different races, then indeed there is no hope of averting the ultimate catastrophe. It is an inherent and basic purpose of Afro-Asian solidarity to work together against precisely these retrograde forces which, unless they are fought and overcome now, will eventually gather momentum and overtake all our other achievements and the centuries of human effort which we in the present time have inherited and which we alone can protect.

Let there be no mistake, Mr. Chairman, that it would be singularly unfortunate if we were to look on such problems as if they were problems of concern only to Africa or even Africa and Asia. It is not where those problems arise that is relevant. The fact is that our attitude towards such problems will have a decisive bearing on the future of the entire human race. Whether the fire is burning in Africa or in Asia, we must realize that it is of such urgency as if our own house was on fire. This indeed is the profound conviction of my delegation and I commend to you, Mr. Chairman, that

the outcome of our present deliberations could make the difference between whether our children and grandchildren will live in peace and harmony or face total liquidation in an ultimate conflict.

PART III

UNITED NATIONS SECURITY COUNCIL

Address to the One Thousand and Eighty-Seventh Meeting of the Security Council on February 3, 1964

Mr. President,

The Government of Pakistan has requested this meeting of the Security Council to draw attention to the serious deterioration in the relations between Pakistan and India and to the far-reaching and incalculable consequences of this situation if it is not improved. Considering that one sixth of the human race is involved, we cannot continue in this way without, in the end, inviting an eruption which will be catastrophic to both.

When we requested this meeting, the permanent representative of India is reported to have said at a press conference that "all that can come out"—presumably referring to this meeting —"is a little more mud throwing". Whether this remark anticipated his government's attitude, I do not know. But if it came from any other quarter, this remark would strike me as either flippant or extremely callous. No, Sir, the stakes are too high, the issues too vital, the number of people involved too great for us to seek through "mud throwing" the resolution of a dispute that carries the seeds of a major international upheaval. It is our contention that justice and not "mud throwing" will ultimately resolve this issue, and we are here to place before you the justice of our complaint.

We have come to this distinguished body to obtain its assistance in an impartial examination of the existing situation and to urge upon it the uncontestably vital necessity of remedying it—not exclusively in the interest of the peoples of Pakistan and India, but also in the larger interest of world peace, stability, and prosperity.

The situation to which I refer was brought to the attention of the Security Council in my letter of January 16. I am sure that the members of the Security Council have informed themselves of what has recently happened in Kashmir

and in our two countries and the heavy toll these events have taken in human lives and property, the suffering they have caused, the bitterness they have engendered, the great scars of hate they have reopened. Accounts of the rioting and the consequent uprooting and displacement of large populations bring an ugly and shameful reminder of those unbelievably tragic events which occurred in the two countries in 1947. Nearly seventeen years have passed since then. Is there to be no end to this madness?

For my part, I must place on record my government's deepest anguish at the occurrence of these recent tragic events, whether they happened in India or in Pakistan. In bringing these events to the attention of the Security Council, it is not my intention to present a charge sheet against anyone. No purpose would be served by that. Our endeavour should be to determine the root cause of these tides of violence and to see what it is that makes Pakistan and India such uneasy neighbours and so bedevils their relations.

It is in this spirit that Pakistan comes once again before the Security Council to plead the cause of the people of Jammu and Kashmir at the bar of the world organization.

The government and people of Pakistan are totally committed to the liberation of their Kashmiri brethren. They will not tire; neither will they falter in the long and bitter struggle until the right of self-determination, as pledged to them in the resolutions of the Security Council and the United Nations Commission for India and Pakistan, has been implemented.

It is our firm belief that in waging this peaceful struggle, we are striving to uphold the high purposes and principles enshrined in the Charter of the United Nations—to avert the danger to international peace in Asia and the world and to promote respect for human rights.

At this moment, both stand in peril.

As set forth in my letter of January 16, addressed to you, Mr. President, the reasons for my government's request for an urgent meeting of the Security Council, briefly, are as follows. An extremely tense situation has arisen in Kashmir and throughout Pakistan and relations between my country and India have become strained over the Government of India's policies toward the State of Jammu and Kashmir and more specifically its recently declared intention to "integrate" the State of Jammu and Kashmir with the Indian Union. India is doing this in open violation of its own pledges to the Security Council and in disregared of the rights of the people of the state. As a reaction to Indian policies, the long-suffering people have once again risen in what has been described by foreign observers as "open rebellion against the Bakhshi government and India itself".

This rebellion continues. Despite the intensification by Indian occupation authorities in the state of measures of terror and repression, the brave people of Kashmir are determined to continue their struggle against Indian rule

until liberation is won.

A wall of steel separates India-occupied Kashmir from the outside world. India is trying desperately to conceal what is happening there under a massive blanket of censorship. But enough leaks through to show that India's colonial hold over Kashmir is disintegrating.

In my letter, I have quoted excerpts from the despatches of impartial foreign correspondents to give some indication to the Security Council and the world of the upheaval that has taken place inside Indian-occupied Jammu and Kashmir during the last few weeks. It has paralysed the puppet government of Shamsuddin and the Indian occupation authorities. These despatches show that the massive demonstrations and the paralysing general strike in Kashmir are not only an expression of the resentment of a long-oppressed people against the outrage perpetrated in the Hazratbal shrine against their deepest religious sentiments; they are an expression also of their indignation against continued domination. As the Economist of London, in its issue of January 4, points out, "The theft of the Holy Relic was spark to tinder."

The "incredible drama of religious passions and political rebellion" of the people of Jammu and Kashmir against Indian rule—as a foreign observer puts it—has not ended as the result of the proclamation of the alleged recovery of the Holy Relic and the intensification by India of repressive measures. In an eye-witness account dated January 19, of the happenings of the past few weeks in Indian-occupied Jammu and Kashmir, the correspondent of the Washington Evening Star, the only foreign reporter to visit the area during the recent uprising, stated as follows:

"For two weeks I was the only outside witness in Kashmir to an incredible drama of religious passions and political rebellion . . . for the last eight days Srinagar was cut off from the outside world by landslides, snowstorms and tight press censorship . . . When I left Srinagar on Monday, the general strike that has paralysed Kashmir's economy was in its 18th day, though stores had opened for half days last week allowing a slight resumption of business.

"The successor government of 'Premier' Shamsuddin, a long-time Bakhshi henchman, has virtually ceased to function. For three weeks no government or ruling National Conference Party official dared to appear before the public. Instead they remained indoors guarded by police with fixed bayonets.

"On January 5, the week of growing demonstrations was climaxed when 300,000 Muslims gathered in Srinagar's Red Square, where Mr. Nehru promised Kashmiris self-determination fourteen years ago. On January 7, Indian army troops supported by rifle carrying police occupied Srinagar's streets . . . As the troops patrolled Srinagar, Government

buildings were lit up and fireworks exploded in a bizarre travesty of public celebrations. The sullen and angry population listened to All India Radio broadcasting patently false reports of widespread rejoicing and public speeches by Government leaders.

"During the past fourteen days hundreds of Kashmiris have rushed up to me in Srinagar's streets begging me to tell their story to the world. Their story is that they are desperately unhappy after decades of rule by Bakhshi's iron-fisted and corrupt police state. India is also blamed for installing and supporting a tyrannical regime which suppressed any dissent with police 'interrogations', secret informers and sadistic 'peace brigades'."

The correspondent then goes on to say:

"After two weeks it is impossible for an outsider, even one deeply sympathetic towards India, to believe that India can continue to hold to Kashmir, much less fully integrate it into India without maintaining a police State backed by army troops. India's fifteen-year attempt to win over Kashmir is ending in tragic failure. When humble peasants in Kashmir are asked 'Who is your leader and what do you want?', the answer invariably is, 'Sheikh Abdullah and a plebiscite'."

There were renewed disturbances on January 25 and 26, in Srinagar, Anantnag, and Baramula, all major towns of the State. Black flags were hoisted and a general strike was observed despite police threats to have shops looted if they were found closed. The Indian police employed baton and tear-gas charges and, when these failed to quell the demonstrators, resorted to indiscriminate firing. A despatch in the *Baltimore Sun* of February 1 reports that "estimates of the number dead in these firings have risen to about thirty".

The Indian authorities have prohibited even peaceful demonstrations and processions in major towns of the state. Arrests of Kashmiri leaders continue, the latest being that of Maulana Mohammad Yasin, member of the People's Action Committee. Maulana Masoodi, leader of the People's Action Committee, has been ordered not to leave Srinagar. Kashmiri men and women crossing the seven bridges which connect the two parts of the city are required to do so with hands raised above their heads on the pretext that they may be carrying bombs to blow up the bridges.

According to the *Indian Express* of February 1, complete hartal, that is general strike, was declared in Srinagar on January 31 when the leaders of the people publicly charged that agents provocateurs of the National Conference had on Wednesday attacked the inmates of a hospital, most of whom were victims of the weekend rioting. According to this despatch, the general strike will be observed every Friday until the people's immediate demands are satisfied.

A despatch in the *Times of India* of Delhi, of January 28, 1964, is significant. It says:

"The orderliness and discipline witnessed during the days of the hartals"—that is general strikes—"processions and meetings were remarkable. There was hardly any case of disobedience to the order of the People's Action Committee. In Srinagar, the Government appeared ineffective, and there was almost a parallel administration."

It goes on to say:

"Three battalions of the Rajasthan, Punjab and Central Reserve Police had to be rushed to Kashmir, and the Indian army authorities were requested to help in taking up guard duties at strategic points."

According to a despatch in the *Washington Sunday Star* of January 19, India's Home Secretary "warned that future demonstrations would be put down with a heavy hand". This is to be read with a Reuters despatch in the *Washington Post* of January 5 according to which a mass meeting in Srinagar "passed a resolution charging that recent incidents were an attempt to incite Kashmir Muslims so that, if they protested, India would have another excuse to suppress the freedom movement."

The fear expressed by the people of Kashmir is now confirmed by the news reported in the *Baltimore Sun* of February 1 that "the Indian Army rushed reinforcements to riot-torn Srinagar." This despatch adds that "mobs shouting anti-Government slogans marched through Srinagar and drew fierce police reprisals". The Indian Army has also been called out to assist the police in suppressing the people.

This despatch from Delhi mentions "private admission that additional military strength is needed to keep internal discipline in Kashmir". The Minister of the Indian government, Mr. Shastri, who visited Kashmir, as reported by the *Hindustan Times*, Delhi, of January 31, "drove through almost desolate streets". A Hindu leader of Jammu, Mr. Premnath Dogra, is reported to have sent telegrams to the President of India complaining of "mass suppression".

The background of these recent happenings in Kashmir is explained by the *Christian Science Monitor* of January 22 as follows:

"Since last year, tension in that part of the territory administered by India has grown with the hitherto quiescent Muslim majority apprehensive about moves to integrate Kashmir more closely with India."

The upheaval in the state has gathered further political momentum. The target of the mass movement is the regime of India's puppets and quislings and the whole National Conference Party, which is India's political prop in the state.

The truth is that the people are no longer prepared to tolerate India's hold over the state which began when it marched into Kashmir in October, 1947.

The situation in Kashmir is exemplified by the imprisonment of Sheikh Abdullah since August, 1953. The Security Council will recall that when the Kashmir case was first brought before the Council, India justified the despotic maharajah's accession on the ground that it had been supported by the "most popular" leader of Kashmir, Sheikh Abdullah. Sheikh Abdullah has been described by the Prime Minister of India, Pandit Nehru, as "the lion of Kashmir, beloved of the people in the remotest Valleys of Kashmir" around whose personality "numerous legends and popular songs have grown". Mr. Nehru also has paid tributes to Sheikh Abdullah's "strength and vision which have endeared him to Muslims, Hindus and Sikhs in Kashmir". Mr. Nehru has called him "the biggest and most popular leader in Kashmir" and "a brave man who has led his people through weal and woe".

It was this same leader who was arrested in 1953 at the behest of Mr. Nehru himself and who has since then, with one brief interval of three months, remained incarcerated. For five years from 1953 to 1958 he was held without charge and trial. In October, 1958, he was brought before an Indian court for a mock trial which is still going on.

The prosecution has filed a list of 322 witnesses of which only 81 have been examined during the last five years. I repeat, out of a list of 322 witnesses, only 81 have been examined during the last five years. The end of the trial is nowhere in sight. This judicial farce, staged on trumped-up charges, must for ever remain a blot on the administration of justice in India. The occasion of his arrest in August 1953, provided the Indian Military with the opportunity to resort to indiscriminate shooting of protesting Kashmiris. Over a thousand men, women, and children were mown down. In Sheikh Abdullah's own words, the people of Kashmir "were given a blood bath unparalleled in the annals of Kashmir's history".

The traumatic experience of the people of Jammu and Kashmir under Indian rule moved Sheikh Abdullah to write recently to the President of India from gaol, calling upon him to revise Indian policy with regard to Jammu and Kashmir. May I be permitted to quote from this letter:

> "During the last three centuries, though Kashmir witnessed long periods of misrule and lawlessness, never before has such a tragedy befallen the people and no one has ever had the audacity to touch the Sacred Relic, much less conceive the profane idea of its removal from the shrine. The present tragedy is the greatest ever blow in this Islamic centre known to history."

The Sheikh continues:

> "It is our considered view that this sacrifice is not an isolated incident unconnected with the happenings in the recent past in Kashmir. Of late, Kashmir has been going through a process of dehumanisation. Respect

for moral and spiritual values is cast to the winds, without the slightest qualms of conscience. This process was actually, so to say, initiated in August, 1953, when the unashamed murder of democracy was committed in Kashmir. Thereafter, flagrant disregard of moral values was publicly demonstrated with the sanction and backing of the rulers of Kashmir. Scant respect was shown to law and justice and common man's life and honour were at the mercy of wanton hooliganism. No attempt was made to arrest the process of degradation. On the contrary, crores"—that is, millions—"of rupees of Indian Exchequer have largely been utilised to corrupt the people of Kashmir and almost kill their very soul, so as to 'drug them away' from any possible resistance against the onslaught of their basic human rights.

"The present sacrilege would tragically complete the process of disintegration of the political, moral and spiritual life of the people of Kashmir who could then be dealt with as dumb, driven cattle."

The Sheikh concludes with the following appeal to the President of India:

"In this connection I would draw your attention to the reported indiscriminate arrests recently effected in the valley as also to the use of force which has taken the toll of some valuable human lives. You can appreciate the depth of sorrow and anguish in the minds of Kashmiris, and if even expression of such anguish is gagged, it may lead to grave consequences. It is time that we realize that bullets and lathi (baton) charges and indiscriminate arrests do not help in easing such situations. An early action in the direction of revising the Kashmir policy is equally important, to which I have made a reference earlier. It is the root cause of the evils, which has culminated in the present tragedy."

That is a part of the letter written by Sheikh Abdullah recently from gaol to the President of India.

Despite India's policy, according to Sheikh Abdullah, of "dehumanisation", the flame of freedom has continued to burn ever brighter in the hearts of the people of Jammu and Kashmir. I recall the statement Sheikh Abdullah made in 1961 in the course of his farcical trial by an Indian court. I quote:

"It is a small matter as to what happens to me. But it is no small matter that the people of Jammu and Kashmir suffered poverty, humiliation and degradation. It has been no small matter what they have endured for more than a decade and what they are enduring now. In fact, the state has become a vast prison camp . . . Hundreds of Kashmiris have suffered incarceration for years since 9 August, 1953, under these lawless laws; many were shot by the army and the police; hundreds were maimed and disabled for life; hundreds again were involved in fictitious criminal cases in order to silence their voices . . .

> "These very events have demonstrated the justice of the demand for the immediate implementation of the pledge of the plebiscite given to the people of Kashmir by India, Pakistan, and the United Nations."

He concluded with these memorable words:

> "My voice may be stifled behind the prison walls but it will continue to echo and ring for all times to come. It can never be stopped. It is the voice of human conscience."

Sheikh Abdullah's voice is only an articulation of the feelings in the hearts of the millions of Kashmiris who have again risen in a mighty protest against Indian occupation and domination.

Even Bakhshi Ghulam Mohammed who helped to put him in prison and, under the protection of Indian bayonets, usurped the government of state has been compelled to admit the failure of India's policy in Kashmir to crush the spirit of the people. According to the Press Trust of India, an Indian news agency, Bakhshi Ghulam Mohammad told reporters on his arrival in New Delhi from Srinagar on January 17 this year, that:

> "There are three slogans being raised in Kashmir now: Firstly, an inquiry should be held into the events of 1953 which led to the arrest of Sheikh Abdullah; secondly, Sheikh Abdullah should be released; and thirdly, the demand for the plebiscite should be conceded."

When called to order by the Indian authorities for making such a damaging admission, Bakhshi Ghulam Mohammad obediently issued a "clarification" that "what he had exactly said was that some disgruntled elements, who were opposed to the regime, had raised these slogans."

> "The disgruntled elements who were opposed to the regime" let it be noted, were, in the words of the correspondent of the *Evening Star* "virtually the entire population of this Himalayan-rimmed capital of Srinagar" who "abandoned their homes to spend the daylight hours marching through the cobbled streets and demanding in enraged voices that their Holy Relic be returned to its shrine."

It is this surging mass of humanity which shouted "demands that Sheikh Abdullah, Kashmir's popular former Prime Minister, be released after a decade of imprisonment by India". The "disgruntled elements" are the people of Srinagar who, according to the correspondent, grimly sat for hours amidst falling sleet to express their bitter resentment against "India's recent moves to integrate Kashmir fully into the Indian Union."

These recent moves that precipitated a situation in which, in the words of the *Economist* "the theft of the Holy Relic was spark to tinder" have been set forth in my letter to you, Mr. President, of January 16.

The sinister design of the Government of India to obliterate the special status of the State of Jammu and Kashmir was foreshadowed on October 3, 1963, by Bakhshi Ghulam Mohammad, the then puppet "premier" of Indian-

occupied Jammu and Kashmir. He announced that "a directive had been issued to bring Kashmir closer to the rest of India" and that, "as a first step", it had been decided to change the designations of "Sadar-i-Riyasat", to "Governor" and "Prime Minister" of the state to "Chief Minister", to bring the state in line with the provinces of India. He added that the necessary "constitutional" formalities to give effect to this change would be carried out by the State Assembly when it meets in March, 1964.

The Government of Pakistan protested at once to the Security Council through its Permanent Representative. As stated in his letter of October 9, the proposed step involved yet another breach of India's commitment to the principles of the United Nations Commission for India and Pakistan's resolutions of August 13, 1948, and January 5, 1949.

In reply to that letter the Permanent Representative of India, in his communication of November 12, made the outrageous claim that Jammu and Kashmir is a constituent state of the Indian Union and therefore Indian territory.

Soon afterwards Bakhshi Ghulam Mohammad was replaced by his own nominee, Shamsuddin, as the new puppet "premier" of Indian-occupied Jammu and Kashmir. One of the first acts of that hitherto obscure figure was to install in office, under orders from Delhi, a cabinet in which as many as seven out of twelve ministers and deputy ministers belong to the minority community, even though the population of the state is overwhelmingly Moslem. Shamsuddin then proceeded to dismiss over 100 officers of the state government who were to be replaced by, as he put it, "persons with a more secular and nationalistic outlook". Thus, at one stroke, he purged the state administration of officers whose only shortcoming was that they were, perhaps, in some small measure, psychologically and emotionally resistant to India's policies in respect of their homeland.

Subsequently, on November 27, 1963, the Indian Minister for Home Affairs, Mr. Nanda, announced in the Indian Parliament the following measures to "integrate" the state with India:

(1) An order of the President under article 370 of the (Indian) Constitution was issued on September 25, 1963, integrating the state's legal and medical professions with those of India;
(2) A similar proposal in respect of welfare of labour in the coal mining industry was under consideration;
(3) Representatives of Jammu and Kashmir in the Lok Sabha would be chosen by direct election as in the Indian provinces. Effect will be given to this after the termination of the present emergency;
(4) The Sadar-i-Riyasat and Prime Minister of Jammu and Kashmir would be designated as Governor and Chief Minister respectively. Legislation to give effect to the proposal would be taken up during

the next session of the state legislature.

Mr. Nanda continued—and I quote:

"(5) Article 370 of the Constitution occurs in part XXI of the Constitution which deals with temporary and transitional procedure. Since this article was incorporated in the Constitution many changes have been made which bring the State of Jammu and Kashmir in line with the rest of India. The State is fully integrated to the Union of India. Government are of opinion that they should not take any initiative now for the complete repeal of article 370. This will, no doubt, be brought about by further changes in consultation with the Government and Legislative Assembly of Jammu and Kashmir. This process has continued in the last few years and may be allowed to continue in the same way."

The Indin Prime Minister, Mr. Jawaharlal Nehru, endorsed this statement the same day. He went on to explain that article 370 of the Indian Constitution would be subject to a process of "gradual erosion".

The Government of Pakistan protested to the Government of India against these unlawful and outrageous measures. In a note handed to the Indian High Commissioner to Pakistan on December 14, the Government of Pakistan pointed out that the contemplated measures were deliberately aimed at destroying the basis of agreement on the State of Jammu and Kashmir as embodied in the resolutions of the United Nations Commission for India and Pakistan of August 13, 1948, and January 5, 1949; they also violated the resolutions of the Security Council of March 30, 1951, and January 24, 1957. The Government of Pakistan made it clear to the Government of India that in view of these resolutions, whatever measures the Government of India had taken or might take, whether legislative or administrative, could have no legal effect whatsoever since such measures contravened the pre-existing international legal obligations that India had accepted in respect of the State of Jammu and Kashmir. Those obligations cannot be negatived unilaterally by India through any device, however camouflaged. This protest note also made it clear that all Indian actions of this nature, already taken or contemplated, were illegal and *ultra vires* because of the provisions of the resolutions of the United Nations Commission for India and Pakistan, to which India is a party, that the future of the State of Jammu and Kashmir can be determined only by the people of Kashmir themselves through a free and impartial plebiscite conducted under United Nations auspices.

Furthermore, in a second letter addressed by the Pakistan Permanent Representative to the President of the Security Council on January 3 the attention of the Security Council was invited to the above-quoted statements of the Indian Home Minister and the Prime Minister of India. It was pointed

out in the letter that the steps contemplated by the Government of India were patently designed to consolidate India's hold over the bulk of Jammu and Kashmir, to demoralize its people and to interpose further obstacles in the establishment of conditions for the exercise of their free choice in regard to their future, and that, therefore, they constituted a defiance of the Security Council and the principles of the United Nations Charter.

The Government of India, I regret to state, rejected the protest of the Government of Pakistan and termed it "an unwarranted interference in the internal affairs of India".

May I remind the representative of India that Pakistan has never admitted and will never recognize India's false claim to the territory of Jammu and Kashmir in disregard of the right of self-determination of the people of the state, as pledged to them in the resolutions of the Security Council and the United Nations Commission for India and Pakistan.

It is perhaps necessary here to recapitulate, briefly, the background against which the integration measures of the Government of India should be viewed. I need not now recall the story of the circumstances in which India procured the "accession" of the Maharajah of Jammu and Kashmir. The Security Council is familiar with that history. Suffice it to say that the genesis of the dispute is that India obtained the signature of the despotic Maharajah on an instrument of accession at a time when the people of Jammu and Kashmir had risen in rebellion against the Maharajah and ousted his authority from the State. But apart from the fact that this "accession" lacked a legal sanction *ab initio*, how did the Government of India itself represent this accession to the Government of Pakistan or to the United Nations?

According to their statements, the so-called "accession" was, first, conditional upon the results of a plebiscite of the people of Jammu and Kashmir to be held under international auspices, which would decide whether Jammu and Kashmir should accede to India or to Pakistan; and, second, that it was limited only to the three subjects of defence, communications and foreign affairs. There are innumerable statements to this effect made by the representatives of India from time to time. I shall here quote only three. Immediately after the so-called accession by the Maharajah, the Prime Minister of India, informing Pakistan of it, said in his telegram of October 27, 1947, addressed to the Prime Minister of Pakistan:

> "I should like to make it clear that the question of aiding Kashmir in this emergency is not designed in any way to influence the state to accede to India."

I repeat : "is not designed in any way to influence the state to accede to India". He went on :

> "Our view, which we have repeatedly made public, is that the question of accession in any territory or state must be decided in accordance with

the wishes of the people and we adhere to this view."

The members of the Security Council will note the words: "is not designed in any way to influence the state to accede to India."

When the Government of India brought the question to the Security Council in January, 1948, the representative of India said, at the 227th meeting:

"We desire only to see peace restored in Kashmir and to ensure that the people of Kashmir are left free to decide, in an orderly and peaceful manner, the future of their State. We have no further interest, and we have agreed that a plebiscite in Kashmir might take place under international auspices after peace and order have been established."

Members of the Security Council will note the words: "we have no further interest".

Later, the representative of India reaffirmed his government's position thus:

"The Indian Government was careful, even though the request came from both, to stipulate that it was accepting the accession only on the condition that later, when peace had been restored, the expression of the popular will should be ascertained in a proper manner. It was on that condition, and that condition alone, that the Indian Government accepted accession . . ".

Members of the Security Council will note, again, the words: "It was on that condition, and that condition alone, that the Indian Government accepted accession".

These statements show that India's intervention in Jammu and Kashmir, according to its own declarations, was not intended to make the accession final and that a plebiscite had to be held in Kashmir to decide its future. It might be pertinent to refer here to the summation made by the President of the Security Council, at its 236th meeting. He said:

". . . the documents now at our disposal show agreement between the parties on the three following points:

"1. The question as to whether the State of Jammu and Kashmir will accede to India or to Pakistan shall be decided by a plebiscite;

"2. This plebiscite must be conducted under conditions which will ensure complete impartiality;

"3. The plebiscite will therefore be held under the aegis of the United Nations."

He continued:

"The terms in which the three ideas I have just mentioned are expressed and the consequences to be deduced from them may be matters for discussion, but I think I can say that the three ideas are not themselves disputed between the parties."

I believe that these references—and it is only to avoid undue length that I do not add the many more which are on record—are enough to indicate the position taken by the Government of India before the Security Council, according to which the principle that Jammu and Kashmir would decide its accession by a plebiscite was undisputed, as noted by the President of the Security Council. It was on the basis of this agreement between India and Pakistan, which transcended all other questions in dispute, that the two resolutions of the United Nations Commission for India and Pakistan were accepted by the parties. If they mean anything, they mean that Jammu and Kashmir cannot become part of either India or Pakistan except as a result of a plebiscite conducted under the auspices of the United Nations.

In addition to affirming the provisional and conditional nature of the so-called accession, the representatives of India were at pains, at meetings of the Security Council, to explain that Jammu and Kashmir retained its autonomy within the Indian Union and that, in fact, India had very limited jurisdiction over it. In fact, at one meeting, the representative of India conceded that the determination of the future of Kashmir was a matter over which neither India nor Pakistan had any jurisdiction and that this point was common ground between the two countries. Even later, in 1951, Sir Benegal Rau, then India's representative, explained to the Council that the scope of Kashmir's autonomy was limited only by a few matters having been taken over by the Government of the Indian Union.

This was the way in which India first represented its relationship to Jammu and Kashmir. It was supposed to be a relationship limited in scope and subject to a plebiscite. Then, in spite of these solemn declarations and agreements, on October 27, 1950, the so-called "All Jammu and Kashmir National Conference" adopted a resolution to convene a constituent assembly for the state to determine its "future shape and affiliation". The significance of this manoeuvre was all too plain: it meant that India was arranging, through the coterie sponsored by it in Kashmir, to by-pass the United Nations, and to have the so-called accession rubber-stamped by a compliant agency. Pakistan protested and brought the situation to the attention of the Security Council.

After due deliberation, the Council adopted a resolution on March 30, 1951, whose preamble stated:

> "*Observing* that the Governments of India and Pakistan have accepted the provisions of the United Nations Commission for India and Pakistan resolutions of August 13, 1948, and January 5, 1949, and have reaffirmed their desire that the future of the State of Jammu and Kashmir shall be decided through the democratic method of a free and impartial plebiscite, conducted under the auspices of the United Nations.
>
> "*Observing* that on October 27, 1950, the General Council of the

'All Jammu and Kashmir National Conference' adopted a resolution recommending the convening of a Constituent Assembly for the purpose of determining the 'future shape and affiliation of the State of Jammu and Kashmir.

"*Observing* further from statements of responsible authorities that action is proposed to convene such a Constituent Assembly and that the area from which such a Constituent Assembly will be elected is only a part of the whole territory of Jammu and Kashmir.

"*Reminding* the Governments and authorities concerned of the principle embodied in the Security Council resolutions of April 21, 1948, June 3, 1948, and March 14, 1950, and the United Nations Commission for India and Pakistan resolutions of August 13, 1948, and January 5, 1949, that the final disposition of the State of Jammu and Kashmir will be made in accordance with the will of the people expressed in the democratic method of a free and impartial plebiscite conducted under the auspices of the United Nations.

"*Affirming* that the convening of a Constituent Assembly recommended by the General Council of the 'All Jammu and Kashmir National Conference' and any action that Assembly might attempt to take to determine the future shape and affiliation of the entire State or any part thereof would not constitute a disposition of the State in accordance with the above principle . . .".

During the debate preceding the adoption of this resolution, the Indian representative gave assurances to the Council that the proposed "constituent assembly" would not prejudice the issue before the Council or come in its way. This meant that the question of the accession was to be decided by a plebiscite and India was bound to that commitment. The representative of India said at the 536th meeting of the Security Council:

"Accordingly, provision was made in the Indian Constitution for a constituent assembly for settling the details of the Kashmir constitution. Will that assembly decide the question of accession? My Government's view is that, while the constituent assembly may, if it so desires, express an opinion on this question, it can take no decision on it."

Again, he said at the 538th meeting of the Security Council :

"Some members of the Council appear to fear that in the process the Kashmir constituent assembly might express its opinion on the question of accession. The constituent assembly cannot be physically prevented from expressing its opinion on this question, if it so chooses. But this opinion will not bind my government or prejudice the position of this Council."

Despite these assurances, the Indian-sponsored authorities in Kashmir continued to declare that the assembly would decide the future affiliation

of the State. When the Council met again on May 31, 1951, the President of the Security Council addressed a cablegram to the Foreign Ministers of India and Pakistan which said:

"Members of the Security Council, at its 548th meeting held on May 29, 1951, have heard with satisfaction the assurance of the representative of India that any constituent assembly that may be established in Srinagar is not intended to prejudice the issues before the Security Council, or to come in its way.

"On the other hand, the two communications to me, as President of the Council, from the representatives of Pakistan contain reports which, if they are correct, indicate that steps are being taken by the Yuvaraja of Jammu and Kashmir to convoke a constituent assembly, one function of which, according to Sheikh Abdullah, would be a 'decision on the future shape and affiliation of Kashmir'.

"It is the sense of the Security Council that these reports, if correct, would involve procedures which are in conflict with the commitments of the parties to determine the future accession of the State by a fair and impartial plebiscite conducted under United Nations auspices.

"It seems appropriate to recall the request contained in the resolution of March 30 that the parties create and maintain 'an atmosphere favourable to the promotion of further negotiations and to refrain from any action likely to prejudice a just and peaceful settlement'. The Council trusts that the Governments of India and Pakistan will do everything in their power to ensure that the authorities in Kashmir do not disregard the Council or act in a manner which would prejudice the determination of the future accession of the State in accordance with the procedures provided for in the resolutions of the Council and of the United Nations Commission for India and Pakistan . . .".

Undeterred by the resolution of the Security Council and the admonition of its President, the so-called constituent assembly in Kashmir was convened through rigged elections as an instrument of India's design, first, to by-pass the United Nations—that is, to avoid the plebiscite—and second, to extend the terms of the so-called accession—that is, to consolidate India's hold over Kashmir.

It was at this stage that Sheikh Abdullah proved to be an impediment in India's path because he began to stress that the accession was provisional and, even as such, was limited to a restricted number of subjects. It became an urgent necessity for the Government of India to eliminate him as a factor in the equation. This was done by his arrest and imprisonment. Bakhshi Ghulam Mohammad who was installed in his place undertook to facilitate the steps which were contemplated by the Government of India for tightening its hold over Jammu and Kashmir. By an order promulgated

in 1954, as amended from time to time, the Government of India has sought to reduce, step by step, the status of Jammu and Kashmir to a province of the Indian Union. The integration of the state's services with the rest of India and the extension of the jurisdiction of the Comptroller and the Auditor-General and of the Election Commissioner and the Supreme Court to the state were some of the steps in this process. Each of these measures could be made to appear as minor and innocuous in nature, but taken together they compel the functioning of Jammu and Kashmir as a unit of the Indian Union.

These measures, all taken in violation of international agreement and in defiance of the Security Council's resolution which I have quoted, eventually led to the adoption, in November, 1956, of a "constitution" by the "constituent assembly" in Kashmir. This "constitution" declared: "Kashmir is and shall be an integral part of the Union of India". Pakistan again brought the matter to the Security Council's attention, and on January 24, 1957, the Council adopted another resolution, which states:

"*The Security Council* ...,

"*Reminding* the Governments and authorities concerned of the principle embodied in its resolutions of April 21, 1948, June 3, 1948, March 14, 1950 and March 30, 1951, and the United Nations Commission for India and Pakistan resolutions of August 13, 1948, and January 5, 1949, that the final disposition of the State of Jammu and Kashmir will be made in accordance with the will of the people expressed through the democratic method of a free and impartial plebiscite conducted under the auspices of the United Nations.

"*Reaffirms* the affirmation in its resolution of March 30, 1951, and declares that the convening of a Constituent Assembly as recommended by the General Council of the 'All Jammu and Kashmir National Conference' and any action that Assembly may have taken or might attempt to take to determine the future shape and affiliation of the entire State or any part thereof, or action by the parties concerned in support of any such action by the Assembly, would not constitute a disposition of the State in accordance with the above principle . . .".

Again, undeterred by this resolution and despite Pakistan's repeated protests, the Government of India has continued to adopt measures usurping increasing power and authority over the State of Jammu and Kashmir. The taking over of responsibility for the administration of highways, telegraphs, telephones, income tax, broadcasting, and customs, the subordination of the Accounts and Audit Department of the state to the Auditor-General of India, the abolition of the customs barriers and the permit system for entry into and out of the state, the subjection of its economic plans to the authority of the Indian Planning Commission, the imposition of the

authority of the Supreme Court of India over Kashmir, and the arrogation by the President of India of powers to promulgate laws in Jammu and Kashmir by executive feat—all these, among other things, are links in the chain with which Jammu and Kashmir has been shackled.

The latest measures show that India is determined to continue to flout the Security Council by reducing the state to the level of a mere administrative unit of India.

It is manifest that the people of Indian-occupied Jammu and Kashmir would have none of this so-called "integration" with India. I have quoted sufficiently from foreign observers, from the moving letter of Sheikh Abdullah written from behind prison bars, and from the admission of Bakhshi Ghulam Mohammad himself, to show that the "incredible drama of religious passions and political rebellion" is directed against any kind of political association with India.

The people of Jammu and Kashmir demand self-determination. They demand a plebiscite.

The indictment in Sheikh Abdullah's letter speaks for itself. He has stated that in his considered view the Hazratbal sacrilege

> "is not an isolated incident unconnected with the happenings in the recent past in Kashmir"—a past in which tens of millions "rupees of the Indian exchequer have largely been utilized to corrupt the people of Kashmir and almost killed their very soul so as to "drug them away" from any possible resistance against the onslaught on their basic human rights."

Sheikh Abdullah has demanded a revision of India's policy in regard to Jammu and Kashmir, a policy which, according to him, "is the root cause of all the evils which have culminated in the present tragedy."

What is India's response? Has the present upheaval in Kashmir made it pause and reflect? Is the Government of India prepared to pay heed to the anguished protest of the people of Indian-occupied Jammu and Kashmir against the denial of their inalienable rights?

There is no indication of any change of heart on India's part. It is determined to continue with its plans for the forcible annexation of the State. The Indian Home Minister's statement in the Indian Parliament on November 27 remains unretracted.

Indian newspapers are full of inspired reports that the panacea, the sovereign remedy for all the ills of Kashmir is to complete the process of annexation at one stroke. To this end, India's agents in Kashmir have been summoned to Delhi to take counsel with the legal sophists of the Government of India.

Officers of the Indian Government are being planted in key administrative and police posts in the state. The Indian bureaucracy is being

superimposed on the Shamsuddin government. These insidious measures, designed to tighten India's own grip on Kashmir, are presented to the world as steps to "strengthen" and "clean" the state administration.

This is the grave situation that I have to bring to the attention of the Security Council. Pakistan is directly concerned and involved in the fate of the people of Jammu and Kashmir. Pakistan is pledged to ensure that the people of Jammu and Kashmir exercise their right of self-determination as spelled out in the resolutions of the Security Council and the United Nations Commission for India and Pakistan. The Security Council has twice adopted resolutions re-affirming that the final disposition of the State of Jammu and Kashmir will be made only in accordance with the will of the people exercised through the democratic method of a free and impartial plebiscite conducted under the auspices of the United Nations.

Consequently, the Government of Pakistan is honour bound, in duty and good faith, to request the Security Council to call upon India to cease and desist from any action contrary to that decision to which India itself is a party. That decision must be urgently implemented. The situation inside Kashmir and in the Indo-Pakistan sub-continent demands it.

As stated in my letter of January 16, India's iniquitous policies in Jammu and Kashmir have led to upheavals in that state. The present rebellion has further aggravated relations between Pakistan and India and led to communal riots in the two countries.

To the deep regret of my government, the tension over the Hazratbal and Kishtwar outrages and the subsequent regime of repression in Indian-occupied Kashmir found expression in some regrettable incidents on January 3 against the Hindu minority in the Khulna and Jessore districts of East Pakistan. The disorder was promptly suppressed and normal life restored in the two districts.

Exaggerated reports of these incidents in East Pakistan were published in the Indian Press, Indian political leaders made inflammatory statements from the platform of the annual session of the ruling Congress Party of India at Bhubaneshwar. Within hours of those speeches, the existence of the Muslim minority in the city of Calcutta and in a number of other districts of the Indian state of West Bengal was placed in direct jeopardy. Widespread acts of killing, arson, and destruction of property took place. A large number of innocent men, women and children have been done to death. Over 75,000 were rendered homeless and shelterless in Calcutta alone. More than 60,000 terror-stricken Muslim refugees have fled into East Pakistan for sanctuary.

Confronted with this human tragedy, the President of Pakistan made an appeal on January 13 to the people of Pakistan to maintain calm, emphasizing the supreme need for preserving communal peace despite the

anxiety and provocation that the tragic events in West Bengal had caused them.

The President of Pakistan also sent an urgent appeal to the President of India to take immediate and effective steps to restore order and peace in Calcutta and other areas of West Bengal, such as would create a sense of security in the minds of the Muslim minority and enable the Muslim refugees to return to their homes. He emphasized that this was in the larger interests of both India and Pakistan.

He observed that he could not help feeling that:

"In thus taking the law into their own hands, with a view to driving the Muslims out of West Bengal into East Pakistan, certain elements in the majority community in West Bengal may have been encouraged by the policy that the Government of India has been following over the last two years, despite our protests and appeals, to drive out Indian Muslims living in the districts bordering East Pakistan."

Nearly 10,000 Indian Muslims had thus been pushed out into East Pakistan by the end of last December, prior to the latest communal disorders and disturbances. Since then, as stated earlier, over 50,000 more refugees have fled into East Pakistan as a result of these disturbances.

The Indian President's reply to this appeal was unhelpful. In a message to the President of Pakistan on January 16, he sought to put the entire blame for the killings and destruction in Calcutta and West Bengal on the Khulna incidents in East Pakistan. He went on to accuse the Pakistani leaders and the Pakistani press of doing "everything to rouse communal passions to an uncontrollable pitch".

Refraining from engaging in a controversy over facts, the President of Pakistan replied:

"It would, I think, be most unfortunate if you and I should get involved in an exchange of recriminations. This would deflect attention from our real purpose.

"This purpose is that the lives and property of the minority community must be fully protected; that communal peace must be maintained and that the minority community must not be looked upon as a hostage.

"By blaming and thus impliedly condoning communal killings and destruction in one country on similar instances in the other, we might unwittingly lend encouragement precisely to these evil forces which it is Government's duty to curb."

The President of Pakistan went on to say :

"What is really needed is that whatever steps are necessary should be most urgently taken to restore law and order and meet out deterrent punishment to the criminals who have been responsible for killing

innocent men, women and children.

"We are, Mr. President, faced with a grave human problem. It will not be solved by shutting our eyes to it, as for example, Mr. Nanda's statement that on January 14 'absolute communal harmony prevailed in Calcutta'. Nor can we solve this problem by blaming others for creating it. Let leaders in each country look into their own hearts and resolve to put their own house in order. The rest will follow."

In his message the Indian President made a suggestion that the President of Pakistan should join with him in an appeal to the peoples of the two countries to maintain communal peace and harmony. In reply, President Ayub Khan pointed out :

"As you know, Mr. President, I have already issued an appeal to my people. I took the earliest opportunity to do so. I do not see how a second appeal by me would have any greater effect. What is required is that stern measures are taken against those miscreants who are responsible for recent incidents in Dacca and Narayanganj—that is in Pakistan—and prevent the trouble from spreading. This is what the Government of East Pakistan are doing, with the full backing and support of my Government."

In order to restore communal peace and harmony in East Pakistan, we had to resort to firing on our own people.

Mr. President, this reply rose above the level of controversy. It was filled with a human concern and compassion for the sudden and tragic fate that had overtaken tens of thousands of innocent men, women, and children for no fault other than that they belonged to a minority community.

It is a matter of the deepest regret to my government that the contagion of rioting in Calcutta and other parts of West Bengal spread subsequently to Dacca and Narayanganj and certain other districts of East Pakistan. However, the East Pakistan authorities, with the full support of the Government of Pakistan, took stern and deterrent measures to suppress the disorders and the situation has, I have the satisfaction to say, returned to normal.

Nevertheless, the communal situation in the affected areas of both countries remains tense and needs continued vigilance.

It is the paramount duty of any civilized government to protect the basic human rights of all its citizens regardless of their faith and belief.

The reason why I have referred to the recent communal riots in India and Pakistan is not to engage in an apportionment of praise or blame. It is axiomatic that the safety of all their peoples, regardless of faith or persuasion, is the responsibility of the governments concerned.

The Indian case on Kashmir is always presented with a great deal of

rhetoric about the secular nature of the Indian state. The reality is that the denial of the right of self-determination to the people of Jammu and Kashmir is embittering the relations between India and Pakistan, a direct result of which is the poisoning of relations between Hindus and Muslims in the two countries.

The denial of this basic right to the people of Jammu and Kashmir and the persistence of communal tension and unrest are part of the same deep-seated malady—the refusal by Indian leadership to break with the unhappy past of this sub-continent, to accept the reality of Pakistan's existence, and to live with it in friendship.

We have always pleaded with our neighbour that we must finally settle the dispute over Kashmir if our peoples are to enjoy the blessings and benefits of peace. One now hears it said from the Indian side that this feeling of conflict between the two countries is due to something mysterious in the minds and hearts of our people, some primordial animus which can never be eradicated. Such statements are either counsels of despair or pretexts for evading a settlement of the major problem that has plagued the two countries since their independence. When the Kashmir dispute was first brought before the Council, the representative of India said :

> "We hope to be able to convince the Security Council that once we have dealt with the Kashmir question, there will probably not be anything of substance which will divide India and Pakistan."

We entirely agree. But what has happened, in fact, is that the Kashmir dispute has been allowed to fester for sixteen years. The theft from Hazaratbal was a spark to the powder barrel. To quote from a despatch of the *London Observer* of January 26:

> "It is not really surprising that the theft of the sacred hair of the Prophet Mohammed in a Srinagar mosque should have started the chain reaction that ended in the blood-bath of Calcutta."

The dispute has poisoned Pakistan-India relations, heightened tension between them to a grave pitch, and poses a serious threat to peace and security in South-East Asia. What is developing is a situation pregnant with manifold dangers which can be averted only if a just and honourable solution is urgently found. Thus alone can Pakistan-India relations be established on a good-neighbourly basis and a climate created in both countries wherein the minorities may live in peace and security.

When the Kashmir issue last came up before the Security Council two years ago, the Government of India's stand was that the United Nations Commission for India and Pakistan resolutions of August 13, 1948, and January 5, 1959, calling for a plebiscite in Kashmir, could not be implemented because Pakistan, according to India, had not carried out its part of the obligations under those resolutions.

Pakistan's Permanent Representative then proposed to the Council that Pakistan would be agreeable to any method that may be suggested: (*a*) to determine the obligations of the parties under these resolutions; (*b*) to determine what was holding up progress and implementation; (*c*) to determine whether either of the parties was in default with regard to the fulfilment of its obligations; and (*d*) what was needed to be done by either side to move the matter forward towards implementation. The Permanent Representative of Pakistan further declared that if a determination of these questions disclosed that Pakistan was in default in any of the respects, the default would be rectified through the speediest method, at the earliest possible moment, so that the way may be opened toward full implementation of the resolutions. This was an undertaking that he submitted to the Security Council on hehalf of the Government of Pakistan.

India refuses to submit its differences with Pakistan in regard to these matters either to mediation or to arbitration, limited merely to such questions of fact. In other words, India arrogates to itself the role of both the accuser and the judge.

India's contention has been that the so-called accession of the State of Jammu and Kashmir to India is final and complete. In the Indian view, therefore, there is nothing that remains to be done in regard to Kashmir.

Clearly this is not a view which Pakistan can or will ever accept. It is not a view that the Security Council can accept. Above all, this Indian attitude rules out any prospect of a settlement of this inflammable issue through peaceful means.

Indian spokesmen have claimed that since three elections have taken place to the state assembly in Kashmir which has supported "the state's accession" to India, it is no longer necessary to hold a plebiscite to determine whether the people of Jammu and Kashmir wish their state to accede to India or to Pakistan.

Quite apart from the fact that elections to a legislature can never be the equivalent of a plebiscite on the specific issue of accession, these elections were held to a so-called constituent assembly and its successor assemblies in Indian-occupied Kashmir. I have already referred to the assurances given by India, the solemn statements made before the Security Council and in correspondence between the governments of India and Pakistan, that this assembly would not decide the question of accession or come in the way of the Security Council. Even if these elections had been fair and free, therefore, they were not, on India's own admission, capable of bringing about a resolution of the problem regarding the disposition of Jammu and Kashmir.

But the facts of the situation are that these elections were farcical, entirely farcical. In 1951, all of the 45 nominees of the National Conference which is

the clique in Kashmir sponsored by the Indian Government for the 45 constituencies in the Kashmir Valley and Ladakh were declared to have been returned unopposed; and no polling took place on the date fixed for the ballot. In 1957, only 8 out of the 45 seats for the Kashmir Valley and Ladakh were contested and in these the opposition was a token opposition. The *Economist* of London, on April 6, 1957, described this as a "solemn farce".

The *New York Times* of March 8, 1957, commented:

"This is not an 'election' in any sense of the word. The term election means a choice. The Kashmiris have had none.

"What happened is no credit to India, no reflection of sentiment among the Kashmiris and no contribution to a solution of this thorny problem."

In 1962, the *Times of London* of February 5 reported that "the field is just left clear for political supporters of India". Even a pro-Indian group, the Democratic National Conference, as reported in the *Statesman* of Delhi, on March 23, 1962, said that "the whole election is false". *The Guardian* of February 16, 1962, reported that these elections would "once again provide no test of the popular will". It added that the opposition was being eliminated by the permit/licence-raj—meaning that those who opposed the governing party get no industrial licence or import permit—and there is a peace brigade to deal with recalcitrants. *The Organizer* of New Delhi of March 12, 1962, described these elections as a "sordid scandal". *The Hindustan Times* of Delhi commented editorially on February 12, 1962, that it was extraordinay that in 32 out of 42 constituencies, Bakhshi Ghulam Mohammad had left no work for the Election Commissioner, and asked: "Is it that the policies of his Government are so universally accepted that we might as well replace in his domain the process of election by the process of acclamation?"

This, in brief, gives us a glimpse of the so-called elections in Kashmir which are alleged to have accorded popular consent to the annexation of the state by India. It is small surprise that an article in the *Hindustan Times* of Delhi of January 8, 1964, should have described the Indian-sponsored regime in Kashmir as "sustained by electoral fraud" and "so thoroughly exposed as being without popular allegiance". It is pertinent to quote here the view expressed by *the Guardian* of December 31, 1963:

"It is widely assumed—even by many Indians—that in a plebiscite more Kashmiris would opt for Pakistan than for India; that is one reason why Mr. Nehru long ago withdrew his agreement to a plebiscite, and why elections in Kashmir, unlike those in the undisturbed parts of India, hardly have even the crudest appearance of being free and democratic."

This explosive issue will not be resolved by India claiming it to be a

domestic affair. It will not be resolved by putting forward disingenuous arguments in support of a fictitious Indian claim to the state's territory. It will certainly not be resolved by shutting our eyes to its existence.

On the other hand, the situation could conceivably grow worse, as indeed it has been growing worse over the years and in the last few weeks.

During the last Security Council meeting on this issue two years ago, the majority view, as expressed in the statement of the Council members and in the Council's draft resolution, was that India and Pakistan should enter into bilateral negotiations to find a just and honourable settlement of this dispute.

In November, 1962, through the good offices of the United States and Great Britain, the President of Pakistan and the Indian Prime Minister agreed to undertake bilateral talks to seek a solution of the Kashmir problem. I had the honour to represent the Government of Pakistan in those negotiations. They started in the last week of December, 1962, and continued till May, 1963. They ended in complete failure. The negotiations failed because of India's intransigent stand against any just and honourable settlement of the dispute and its refusal to move from its rigid position.

The Governments of the United States and Great Britain which throughout the course of bilateral negotiations strove to encourage and assist both parties to reach an agreement then offered their good offices in another form. They proposed that the two countries agree to the appointment of a mutually acceptable mediator to assist them in arriving at an early settlement of this dispute. While Pakistan was still engaged in seeking certain clarifications from the United States and British Governments on the mediation proposal, the Prime Minister of India effectively sabotaged it by a statement in the Indian Parliament on August 13, 1963.

This was followed on October 3, as I have stated, by the announcement of India's plans to proceed with the integration of the State of Jammu and Kashmir, first by the Bakhshi Ghulam Mohammed Government and later by India's spokesmen, with the disastrous consequences that are taking place in Jammu and Kashmir at present.

I would appeal to the members of the Security Council to undertake steps which would carry this dispute towards a speedy and peaceful solution.

The situation that I have described to the Security Council demonstrates beyond all doubt that the passage of time will not—and I repeat, will not—help to reconcile the people of Jammu and Kashmir to Indian occupation and domination. It must be borne in mind that unarmed as they are, muffled as their voices are by the barrier flung between them and their kith and kin in Azad Kashmir and Pakistan, unrepresented as they are, consigned tragically to oblivion as they are, they are persisting in the eternal struggle of the oppressed peoples for freedom. Their struggle is heroic. All the more so

because, in terms of brute force, the odds against them are exceptionally heavy. India has one soldier in Kashmir for every ten men. I wonder how in human justice, by all the considerations that govern the morality of nations, Pakistan can be expected to remain a spectator if the people of Kashmir continue to be suppressed by force.

Though sixteen years have passed without the agreement regarding Kashmir being carried out, there has never been any time when there has been any acquiescence on the part of Pakistan or the people of Kashmir in India's occupation of the major part of Kashmir. There has never been any time when we have abated or abandoned our rightful claim. There has never been any time when a search was not pending for a peaceful solution of the problem consistent with the basic principle agreed between the parties. And there has never been a time when the strain of the dispute in the entire India-Pakistan situation has shown any sign of being eased or when the tensions that it has caused have relaxed.

I venture to submit here that if the doctrine of the passage of time resulting in an advantage to one party in an international dispute is upheld, then it would be just as well if we consider the Charter of the United Nations to have been abrogated. Certainly, no one must then demand the end of any colonial regime because there is no colonial regime which has not behind it the sanction of time much longer than that commanded by the Indian occupation of Kashmir. If the Security Council was exercised over Kashmir in 1948, why should it not be exercised over it in 1964? If it be said that the circumstances have changed, they have changed only in this respect that in 1948 the people of Kashmir were engaged in armed fighting against India in Kashmir, and in 1964 they have only recently risen in rebellion again. If this change is supposed to operate to the disadvantage of those who laid down their arms on the pledge given by the United Nations that their rights would be peacefully secured, is it not a virtual inducement to them to resume hostilities? Assuming that it is not the purpose of the Security Council or of any member to proffer such an inducement, how can the passage of time be considered as a ground for the continuance of India's possession of the greater part of Kashmir?

If this question is realistically faced I am confident that the members of the Security Council will perceive that the issues involved here are the issues of the rights of the smaller states against their domineering neighbours and of the sanctity of international agreements. There is no conceivable situation where the passage of time will not operate to the advantage of the party that is stronger in physical force, though it may be weaker in human right and natural justice. The world has witnessed two global wars in this century which were fought ostensibly for the preservation of the rights of smaller states. If a precedent is now established in Kashmir which allows the rights

and the claims of a smaller state to be over-borne by a stronger party, aided by the passage of time, and an international agreement to be disregarded, then the principles of the Charter and of all other statements, like those issued recently by Chairman Khrushchev of the USSR and President Johnson of the United States regarding the renunciation of force in the settlement of territorial disputes, lose their meaning.

I have come before this august body earnestly to urge, in the name of my government and, above all, in the name of humanity, that the Security Council take appropriate action to ensure that the Kashmir dispute moves rapidly towards an honourable and just solution in the interest of the well-being of the people of the India-Pakistan sub-continent and in the interest of peace in Asia. The people of Kashmir have unmistakably risen in open rebellion and, unless we refuse to hear their voice, we can no longer doubt that they are unreconciled to Indian occupation and domination. Any passage of time notwithstanding I am confident that the Council will consider it urgent to ensure that India refrain from aggravating the situation by proceeding with any measures to annex the state in violation of the international agreement and the right of the people of Jammu and Kashmir to decide their future for themselves.

I said at the outset that one sixth of the human race is involved. To these people, most of whom live in deep and measureless poverty, the alleviation of their condition presents a challenge, the enormity of which has, perhaps, no precedent in human history. Both our countries confronted with urgent and compelling problems. How utterly wrong and wasteful it is that we should dissipate our national energies and engage in conflict with one another.

We, the peoples of Pakistan and India, sought and won our freedom in order to fashion our lives with dignity and self-respect, free from privation and fear, to remove the sufferings that our peoples have endured since humam memory can recall. After seventeen years where do we find ourselves? We find our horizons darkened by the clouds of conflict and hate; we find ourselves facing the dark prospect of a fearful and a dreadful storm. Is it not a most dreadful prospect? Is it not a most lamentable situation? But it lies with us, with this distinguished body and with Pakistan and India, to change this course of events. It is within our power, Mr. President, to find the means to live in peace provided there is a will to live in peace.

Freedom can be delayed by oppression, but it cannot ultimately be denied. The course of history is relentlessly so set. And so I say that the people of Kashmir will one day be free. Whether this freedom will come through violence or upheaval, or whether it will come through peaceful means and civilized conduct, depends largely on the decisions this body makes and the respect we show for its decisions.

Address to the One Thousand and Eighty-Ninth Meeting of the Security Council on February 7, 1694

Mr. President,

In the first paragraph of his statement of two days ago, the Education Minister of India uttered the admonition that the Security Council is not intended as a platform for propaganda against any member state. The members of the Council will have had time to study the statement of the representative of India and to judge in what manner he followed his own dictum.

From the beginning to the end the representative of India, consistently refusing to face the facts and issues, resolutely ignoring the arguments presented by Pakistan, devoted himself to hurling irresponsible and vile charges against Pakistan and accusing it of the most unbelievable crimes. First, the very fact that Pakistan has dared to come before the Security Council, an organ charged with the primary responsibility for the maintenance of peace, is, in the eyes of India, a misdemeanor on Pakistan's part and evidence of its "agitational" approach.

Then Pakistan was accused of being a theocratic state while India, which has witnessed 550 communal riots since it became independent, is a secular state. India, he said, has a modern, rational and secular attitude while Pakistan is reactionary. Pakistan's philosophy, according to him, is that in the very nature of things, Muslims must hate the Hindus and the Hindus must hate the Muslims. Pakistan's policy is based on communal hatred and fanaticism and the Pakistan Government, he stated, "deliberately and for set purpose created an atmosphere that riots should break out in East Pakistan". Then turning from accusor to judge, he delivered judgement: "The Pakistan Government cannot be absolved of its responsibility for the deaths of these innocent people".

He went on to say that the real reason why Pakistan was insisting on a plebiscite was:

> "... to try and see whether it cannot inflame communal passions in Kashmir by appealing to the inhabitants of that State that their religion is in danger and to bring about the recurrence of the terrible events of the partition of India in 1947, bloodshed, migrations, untold human miseries."

Then again, Pakistan was, in the view of the representative of India, playing "the Chinese game of weakening India internally and undermining its defence against China" in order to prevent India from fulfilling its self-appointed role of saving the whole world from China. The Permanent Representative of India had promised on the eve of the meeting of the Security Council that there would be a good deal of mud-throwing at this meeting. Members will agree that the Minister of Education of India has not disappointed the expectations of his Permanent Representative. I reject, with all the emphasis at my command, the false and absurd charges that he has hurled against my government.

On Kashmir itself, what the representative of India had to say was not new. Members who have studied the case will be familiar with all his arguments on Pakistan's alleged aggression, the absolute right of the despotic Maharajah to sign away the rights of the people of Kashmir, the acquisition by India of the imperial mantle of paramountcy, the three elections held in Kashmir under the surveillance of the four Indian divisions stationed there. These arguments are as contradictory as they are unconvincing. I must nevertheless, for the record, correct the misstatements and distortions with which the Minister of India has sought to confuse and distort the simple issue of self-determination involved in the Kashmir dispute.

But before I do so, may I be permitted to deal briefly with the grave accusations and charges levelled against my government and my country by the representative of India.

It is with the utmost reluctance that I turn to the matter of communal riots which recently broke out in my country and in India. In my earlier submission to the Council I refrained from dealing at length with the communal situation in order not to worsen the existing grave situation. The Minister of India, by making irresponsible, unfounded and provocative charges against my country, has in effect added fuel to the fire and I must regret that he should have chosen the path of calumny and slander to bolster India's bad case on Kashmir. I would be failing in my duty if I did not put the record straight on the treatment of minorities in "secular, modern, rational" India.

The Education Minister of India said: "If we are left to ourselves we will have no communal trouble whatsoever". How does he reconcile this

statement with the fact that since the Minorities Agreement concluded between the Prime Ministers of Pakistan and India in April, 1950, there have been more than 550 riots in India? In fact, hardly a Muslim festival has passed in India since 1950 without the Muslim community being subjected to attacks of communal frenzy in one part of India or another. In contrast, there has been complete communal peace in Pakistan, but for two or three riots, until the recent disturbances broke out.

In March, 1961, scores of Muslims were killed in Jubbulpore and the Chief Minister of Madhya Pradesh was reported to have said that the city "looked like a cremation ground". Was not India being left to itself then? In October, 1961, the Home Minister of the State of Uttar Pradesh admitted that behind the then current anti-Muslim riots, there was a wide and deep-laid conspiracy. He declared:

> "This can go on record that a common pattern is discernible behind all these incidents. Murders were committed in individual knife attacks by young people coming from the section of our society whose members would faint at the sight of blood."

He goes on to say:

> "This showed that these people have received training in the art of killing. One would not be surprised, as days pass, if communal incidents increase in number and in intensity."

Did this Indian official say that Pakistan was training these murderers? Could he say that Pakistan was behind the deep conspiracy? Was Pakistan inciting the Hindus of India to kill Muslims? Was not then India being left to itself?

Speaking in the Indian Parliament, Mr. Syed Badrudozza, a veteran of the Indian struggle for independence, expressed the agony that the Indian Muslims were suffering soon after the gruesome atrocities of Jubbulpore and Malda were perpetrated:

> "Even in this secular democracy, Mussulmans and all the minorities of India have suffered terribly. We apprehended that minorities would have no quarter, no shelter, no opportunity for self-expression. Politically, socially, culturally, economically and even physically they would be at the mercy of forces of reaction. That is exactly what has happened."

Continuing, this member of the Indian Parliament said:

> "Mussulmans have been pursued to the bitter end. They have been tortured with every refinement of cruelty and barbarous savagery. In malignity, in cruelty, in savagery, in criminality, the records of Jubbulpore and Malda surpass any records during the British regime."

This systematic massacre of Muslims followed a pattern which was particularly noticeable during the recent riots, when the attacks were aimed at driving the Muslims out of West Bengal, forcing them to seek

shelter in East Pakistan. Although a large number of men, women and children were killed, the emphasis was on setting fire to their houses, looting and destroying their shops and industrial establishments so as to deprive them, at once, of their shelter and their means of livelihood. The fact that there have since been open demands by militant Hindu organizations tends to support my government's fear that the real intention of those responsible for the riots is to drive the Muslims out of West Bengal into East Pakistan.

The Minister of India accused Pakistan of having incited the recent riots. I do not wish to harrow the Council with a recital of the blood-curdling headlines and reports carried on in the Indian West Bengal press on the regrettable incidents which occurred in Khulna and Jessore. Let us turn instead to the testimony of impartial foreign observers.

As regards the recent riots in Calcutta, here is a report from Calcutta by James Mitchell, correspondent of the Observer of London, published on January 25:

> "While rioters made no great secret of their plans, the police force in the first days seemed always to be everywhere except in the streets attacked."

He blames what he calls "the black week of Calcutta" on "police laxity" and says that the authorities "let the situation get completely out of hand" and that the result was that about 500 people were killed. According to this report, tens of thousands lost their homes because, after the riots started, interested people paid big sums of money to keep them up, so that landlords would clear their land of poor tenants. Did Pakistan inspire this cold-blooded design?

We hear a great deal about the secular outlook in India. A Calcutta daily, *the New Age*, of January 19, 1964, said:

> "Unfortunately, the secular parties could not take proper initiative in the matter and the so-called nationalist paper fanned up communal hatred. The Jan Sangh and Hindu Mahasabha were already in the field whipping up frenzy. All these contributed to the rapid deterioration in the situation."

I had no intention to bring out these gruesome facts had I not been compelled to do so by the Indian allegations levelled against my government before this Council. I was shocked to note that the Education Minister of India fell victim to the temptation of quoting highly exaggerated figures of deaths during the recent troubles in East Pakistan on the basis of a Reuters despatch. The sources in Dacca quoted by the correspondent of Reuters have themselves contradicted the wildly exaggerated figures that were given out. I regret that the Minister of India had to resort to the use of unverified reports which he should have known were contradicted. The Pakistan High Commission in New Delhi issued an immediate

contradiction on January 24. The irresponsibility of the Indian Government's news media in giving circulation to such false and inflammatory reports earned the well merited stricture of the London Times. In its issue of January 23, its Delhi correspondent observed:

"The Indian Government's seriousness in discouraging circulation of news about communal violence in Pakistan was put into doubt today by All India Radio's treatment of the Reuters correspondent's report from Dacca. The midday news broadcasts made that report their first item and it still figured prominently in bulletins later tonight. All India Radio is a completely subservient agent of the government and its treatment of the report must suggest that Delhi is not as apprehensive about the dangers of repercussions in West Bengal as its recent experience should have made it."

My government firmly believes that communal peace and security is an essential condition of civilized life and my government mobilized all its resources to bring this situation under complete control in Pakistan.

I had to go into this question at some length, not only to disprove the false allegations made by India, but to emphasize one central fact.

It is that the denial of the right of self-determination to the people of Jammu and Kashmir is a constant source of tension. It is embittering the relations between India and Pakistan. As a result of this festering dispute, recurring brutal attacks on the Muslim minority have been taking place in India ever since its independence in 1947.

It is this attitude of the Government of India which has created a vicious climate in Kashmir and in certain parts of India, to which I invited your attention in my letter of January 16. I quote:

"It is this climate, in which the political, religious and cultural rights of the people of the State are treated with scorn by their Indian rulers that has made possible such criminal acts of sacrilege and vandalism as the recent theft of the sacred hair . . . from the . . . shrine near Srinagar and the attempt to burn a Muslim shrine in Kishtwar in Jammu Province."

It is this same climate which encourages militant organizations in India to stage frequent communal attacks and outrages on the Muslims and call for their expulsion from India in exchange for the Hindu minority in Pakistan. It is this disregard of human rights which is the root cause of the existing upheaval in Kashmir and of the grave communal tension in West Bengal. It all flows from the fact that the Kashmir dispute has been allowed to fester for sixteen years.

While speaking about the eviction of Indian Muslims from Tripura, Assam and the border districts of West Bengal, the Education Minister of India took shelter behind a massive array of census figures. He named

the districts of Noakhali, Comilla, Sylhet, and Bakarganj, where the relatively slow growth of population is attributed to the migration of Muslim population to India. Of these, Bakarganj has no common border with any part of India and can have no relevance to the issue.

It is interesting to note that only three border districts are named by him; whereas Mymensingh, Rangpur, Dinajpur, Rajshahi, Kushtia and others are also border districts but he carefully left them out. The reasons are not far to seek. The West Bengal districts in which a relatively high increase of Muslim population was shown by him are not contiguous to the Pakistan districts where a slow rate of increase of Muslim population was recorded. Obviously, therefore, there can be no possible connection between these trends of population growth. It is possible to refute the arguments that he has advanced by quoting extensively from the census reports of India and Pakistan to prove that the case he wants to establish is based merely on jugglery of figures. Even without going into a detailed examination of the census reports, one can draw certain obvious conclusions from commonsense.

A system of passports and visas was introduced in 1952 to regulate comprehensively the movements of Indians and Pakistanis across the border. The Indian authorities introduced a strict system of border checkpoints to prevent the entry of non-Indians through unauthorized routes into Indian territory. These restrictive measures resulted in almost complete stoppage of entry to Assam, Tripura, and West Bengal.

Apart from these restrictions, one has to remember the communal feelings and tensions existing at the time of partition of the India-Pakistan sub-continent to appreciate the improbability of large-scale Muslim migration from Pakistan to India. With memories of incredible sufferings, of loss of human lives and destruction of property, it is inconceivable that hundreds of thousands of Muslims, as alleged by India, would surrender the safety and security of their homeland in Pakistan to migrate with their women and children to the uncertain perils awaiting them in a hostile land beyond the frontier.

But let us not get involved in a pedantic controversy, for we deal here not with cold statistics but with human tragedy. The fact of the matter is that hundreds and thousands of innocent men, women, and children have been driven across the border like cattle as part of a premeditated and cold-blooded plot to get rid of Muslim citizens from Indian territory bordering East Pakistan. The special correspondent of the *Times of London* in his desptach of December 5 carried a vivid eye-witness account of his experience:

"In camps and compounds in the Comilla district of Pakistan there are thousands of Muslims who have been forcibly evicted from their

homes in India and driven into East Pakistan. The pretext for the eviction is that these people had illegally entered the Indian territory of Tripura and that they have now simply been sent back; but the evidence available from them shows that most were long settled in Tripura, even for generations."

Continuing he said:

"The long-settled Muslims who are expelled come into East Pakistan as broken refugees with nowhere to turn and the government here now has about 47,000 of them on its hands. The evictions began in the middle of last year and continued at the rate of hundreds each week, the flow being augmented now by those Muslims who flee from the inimical climate apparently created in Tripura by the mass evictions. Putting it at its best, the established residents of Tripura, Indian citizens by right, who have been uprooted and dumped over the border with no formality or only the sketchiest, are the victims of local authorities in that territory whose excesses are not fully appreciated in Delhi. They may be acting in response to local forces of communal enmity and greed for land, but they are acting with injustice and inhumanity."

The special correspondent of the *Times* went on to say:

"Some received 'show cause' notices warning them that they would be expelled unless they could prove that they had been in India before 1952. They say that they went to court with their papers and were told that the magistrate would make further investigations—but that a day or two later the police and lorries came to their villages and they were forced into the lorries and driven to the border. Others received no notices, no warning before the police vehicles arrived. Some of their papers were kept by the court or destroyed by police who expelled them."

And yet the Minister of India waxed eloquent about the respect for the processes of law in his country. He said:

"I also wish to point out that no one is evicted out of India without complying with the provisions of the rule of law."

In view of what impartial observers have to say about the compliance with the rule of law, I believe further comment is superfluous.

Concluding his despatch, the correspondent of the *Times* said:

"It is undeniable that a great wrong is being done to the Indian Muslims in Tripura. In considering what it regards as the problem of Muslims settled in that territory who have no legal right to be there, the Indian Government might consider the analogous problem in Ceylon, where the government would like to get rid of a million Indians."

That is what an impartial observer of a leading British newspaper has to say about the brutal and inhuman methods adopted for the mass eviction of Indian Muslims from Assam, Tripura, and West Bengal. The President

of All-India Hindu Mahasabha, Mr. V. J. Deshpande, declared on January 15, 1964, that an exchange of population on government level was the only way to ensure the safety of minorities in India and Pakistan. He said:

> "They"—the Hindus—"must be brought to India and the Muslim population in Assam and West Bengal must be sent to East Pakistan."

Exchange of population was demanded in public meetings and newspaper editorials in many parts of India. All these point towards one conclusion, that there is a move to expel Indian Muslims by illegal and inhuman methods from Indian territory bordering East Pakistan for no fault of theirs but the fact that they happen to be Muslims.

The Education Minister of India claimed that all these tens of thousands of Indian Muslims who were forcibly evicted from their hearths and homes and pushed across the border into East Pakistan are not Indian nationals. If that be so, India should have no objection to having the facts verified by an impartial inquiry. Speaking on this matter before the General Assembly of the United Nations on September 30, 1963, I said:

> "I would declare here before you that the question whether these people are being evicted or whether they are infiltrators can be tested by a United Nations inquiry commission, by an international inquiry commission or by any third party agreed to by India and Pakistan. These are ascertainable facts. It can be ascertained by any inquiry commission whether these unfortunate, helpless people, driven, at the point of Indian bayonets, into Pakistan are Indians or Pakistanis."

We stand by this declaration even now. We are prepared to have the matter examined by an international commission of inquiry. If India's hands are clean, as it claims, let it come forward and agree to an international commission to verify the facts. The truth in this case is that India is guilty of inhuman and brutal treatment of its own citizens on the ground of their religion. It is indeed a sad commentary on its secularist pretentions.

The Minister of India has stated that the President of Pakistan refused to issue a joint declaration with the President of India to our respective peoples appealing for peace and harmony and that Pakistan, in effect, also rejected the proposal of the Government of India that the Home Ministers of the two countries should meet and visit scenes of disturbances and suggest what further steps should be taken to prevent such happenings.

I have already dealt in my statement of February 3 with the subject of a joint declaration by the two Presidents. The President of Pakistan pointed out that he had already appealed to the people of Pakistan to maintain communal peace and harmony and what was really needed was to take deterrent measures against communal elements and criminal elements which were responsible for the riots in both the countries and to re-establish

conditions of security for the refugees of the minority communities to enable them to return to their homes. This action, the government, for its part, took at once and the flames of communal disturbances were stamped out in my country.

Pakistan did not reject the proposal of the Government of India for a meeting between the Home Ministers of the two governments. We have made a positive and constructive response. This is that once order has been restored, the two Ministers could meet in Rawalpindi in Pakistan or Delhi in India to discuss measures necessary to enable the refugees of the communal disturbances, as well as those who have been evicted by India from Assam, Tripura, and West Bengal for the last two years, to return to their homes.

It is the policy of my government to encourage the refugees to return to their homes. My government is pledged to ensure the security of their lives and property such as will restore their confidence. The Indian Home Minister's statement of January 29, that conditions in East Pakistan have become such as to make the migration of Hindus inevitable and that conditions for the granting of migration certificates to them in East Pakistan would have to be eased is bound to have an unsettling effect on them and to encourage their exodus. We regret this statement all the more because communal harmony has been fully restored in East Pakistan. My government is apprehensive that if a new influx of Hindus into India takes place as a result of the Indian policy to facilitate migration, the position of the Muslim minority in West Bengal, Calcutta and, for that matter, in all other parts of India will be further imperilled.

The Pakistan High Commissioner in Calcutta was besieged during the communal riots in that city by thousands of Muslims demanding emergency certificates to migrate to East Pakistan. We did not respond. In spite of the carnage which took place in Calcutta, no Pakistani leader made any statement or offered encouragement to Muslims in West Bengal or India to move into Pakistan.

In our view, the solution of this problem, I must reiterate once again, lies in bringing about peace and security such as would restore a sense of confidence to the minorities and to take energetic measures for their rehabilitation and resettlement. We seek the co-operation of the Government of India in enabling the refugees to return to their homes.

The representative of India permitted himself to make disparaging remarks about the democratic institutions of Pakistan. May I remind him that each country must fashion its self-governing institutions according to its own genius. It is not necessary for me to cite examples of modern and progressive countries which have found, as a result of their experience, that the system of indirect elections and electoral colleges best meets their

political and constitutional requirements. Pakistan is not the only country which elects its President and Parliament by an electoral college. The parliamentary form of government is not the only form of democratic government. Many countries, particularly those of Asia, Africa and Latin America, and even of Europe and the United States, have found the presidential system to be necessary to ensure their stability and economic progress.

The Education Minister of India has called Pakistan "a theocratic state". May I ask him whether we are governed by a hierarchy of priests? The official name of our state is the Islamic Republic of Pakistan. Does this nomenclature make us a theocracy? Several Muslim countries, members of the United Nations, have the same description or have given recognition to Islam as the official religion of the state. Then are they all priest-ridden? There are also Western European and Latin American states, the constitutions of which provide a place for Christianity as the established state religion. The representative of India, I am certain, would not on that account classify them as theocracies.

We have often been told that in the Indian Union fundamental rights are guaranteed. This is surely not a unique phenomenon. All member states of the United Nations are pledged to respect human rights, and it is their general practice to ensure its observance. The Constitution of Pakistan is no exception, and we see no reason to claim any special credit for treating all the citizens of our multiracial, multi-religious and multi-lingual republic as equals before the law. We do not, therefore, consider it in the least anomalous that the head of the judiciary of our Islamic Republic should be a Pakistani Christian. The Chief Justice of the Supreme Court of Pakistan is a Pakistani Christian belonging to the Roman Catholic denomination who, under our Constitution, is the final authority in the interpretation of all laws, including the personal and religious laws of the Muslims who constitute the majority in Pakistan. We have given representation in the highest services of our state to the minority communities whose leaders have publicly borne testimony to the precept and practice of toleration in Pakistan.

We are told that India is more democratic than Pakistan. Comparisons are odious. But in this context let me take the liberty of quoting the President of India himself, as reported by the *Indian Express* of Bombay of October 4, 1962. President Rajendra Prasad is reported to have said:

> "What we have in India today is not real democracy but only a phony democracy. If we are true democrats, which I may say we are not"—the President observed—"there would not have been so much of discontent and ill will. Then they would not have any kind of nepotism, corruption and communal prejudice which have brought down the

country to degradation."

The representative of India then went on to attack the philosophical and spiritual foundations of Pakistan. He admitted that India and Pakistan are two nations but rejected the two-nation theory. The basis of this theory is that because Hindu society is organized on the religions of the caste system of antiquity, in which personal status is determined by birth in a particular caste in an ascending and descending series of work and dignity, we the people of Pakistan willed to be established a state of our own in the contiguous Muslim majority areas in the north-west and the north-east of the sub-continent, wherein we could live our own way of life governed by the principles of equality which are enshrined in the religion of Islam. The caste system is by its very nature exclusive. It governs those within its fold from the cradle to the grave. Notwithstanding the fundamental rights spelled out in the Indian Constitution, the caste system has not been made illegal, though untouchability has been outlawed at last—but only in law. The distinguished philosopher of history had established that exclusive societies invite disintegration from within. This is what happened in the sub-continent in 1947. But we cannot understand that whenever a dispute is involved, India seeks to make reference to its democratic and secular character, although Indian society is steeped in the caste system, in a venal system, to the exclusion of all other people belonging to all other minorities. It is a system confined to the Hindus.

Anyone outside the pale of the caste system is worse than an untouchable, a sub-human.

So I say that with this society, with this situation, with this mentality prevailing in India, with the treatment it has accorded to its minorities, with the manner in which it has held Kashmir in bondage, there can really be no peace between our two countries. Remove the dispute of Kashmir and you will find that we can live in peace, and we must live in peace, because it is Kashmir alone that divides us.

It is no use making *ultra vires* references to democracy. India displays its democracy like a senile soul displaying its false teeth. Its democracy is as false as the teeth of a senile person who carries false teeth and parades them everywhere. There is democracy in the United Kingdom. Does the United Kingdom always make mention of its democratic institutions when it comes into the Security Council? We have old and established democracies in France and in the United States of America. Is reference always made to the democratic character of their societies in seeking the adjudication and settlement of disputes? The United Nations Charter is wedded to the principle of the equality of all nations irrespective of their internal systems. What has the internal system of Pakistan to do with the settlement of the problem of Kashmir and the dispute of Kashmir?

Let me, therefore, now turn to the main question before the Security Council. The Minister of India made no attempt to explain the declarations of the Government of India which quoted in my last statement to the Security Council that the so-called accession was only provisional, conditional and subject to ratification by the people of Jammu and Kashmir through a plebiscite under international auspices. Instead he chose to dismiss my submissions as "a mixture of misstatements, omissions of material facts and refusal to face up to the clear provisions of the Indian Independence Act". A case is not proved by glossing over or ignoring inconvenient facts.

In our previous representations before the Council, we have endeavoured at ample length to explain the position regarding the accession of states to India or to Pakistan. Of course, there was no controversy regarding those states where the ruler and the people were of the same view, and no conflict was possible between India and Pakistan. In all those cases, naturally, the ruler signed the Instrument of Accession to one or the other country and no trouble ensued either between him and his people or between India and Pakistan. The question arose regarding those states where there was disagreement between the ruler and his people in regard to accession. On this question, the Indian Minister made three statements, and I shall invite the Council to examine them not in relation to our arguments, but in the light of the position internationally advanced by the Government of India. I shall take each of those statements separately. The first statement is:

> "It is significant that there was no provision for consulting the people of the princely states concerned. Nor was there any provision that the accession had to be ratified by ascertaining the wishes of the people of the acceding states."

Contrast this statement with the following, which is from the White Paper of the Government of India issued on August 10, 1948. It says:

> "The Government of India are firmly of the view that whatever sovereign rights reverted to these states on the lapse of paramountcy, they vest in the people, and conditions must be created in every state for a free and unfettered exercise of these rights."

Or with this solemn statement made by the Indian representative at the 227th meeting of the Security Council:

> "On the question of accession, the Government of India has always enunciated the policy that in all cases of dispute the people of the state concerned should make the decision."

These are clear words: the position is not only that the people have to be consulted; it is they who have to make the decision.

And how can the statement now made by the Education Minister of

India be sustained by the one made by the Indian representative at the 264th meeting of the Security Council? He said:

"No doubt the ruler, as the head of the state, has to take action in respect of accession. When he and his people are in agreement as to the Dominion to which they should accede, he applies for accession to that Dominion. However, when he takes one view and his people take another view, the wishes of the people have to be ascertained. When so ascertained the ruler has to take action in accordance with the verdict of the people. That is our position."

"By our position" he means the position of the Government of India. The words are to be noted, "That is our position". This is not the position now advanced by the Minister of India.

And what would he make of this statement of the Prime Minister of India himself, his Prime Minister, made at a public meeting in New Delhi and reported in the *Times of India* of Bombay, of July 7, 1952:

"In any event, from the start, India was committed to the principle of letting the final word regarding accession rest with the people of the princely states and"—let us mark these words—"there could be no getting away from that commitment. In fact, that was why India had accepted Kashmir's accession only provisionally in 1947, pending the expression of the will of the people."

That is the statement of the Prime Minister of India. I could elaborate this argument, but the statement of the Prime Minister of India should at least suffice to take care of the thesis that the Education Minister of India now seeks to foist upon us.

The second statement of the Minister of India is:

"There was no question whatsoever with regard to the religious complexion of the population of the princely states. The question whether one princely state should accede to India or Pakistan was left to the determination of the ruler of the state."

I ask, was there no question whatsoever with regard to the religious complexion of the population of the princely state? Is that true? The Education Minister of India says, No. But how was the question answered by his Prime Minister in the telegram of November 8, 1947, addressed to the Prime Minister of Pakistan? He said:

"But it is essential, in order to restore good relations between the two Dominions, that there should be acceptance of the principle that, where the ruler of a state does not belong to the community to which the majority of his subjects belong, and where the state has not acceded to that Dominion whose majority community is the same as the state's, the question whether the state has finally acceded to one or the other Dominion should be ascertained by reference to the will of the people."

And then, again, if there was no question whatsoever with regard to the religious complexion of the population of the princely states, why did the Government of India protest regarding the accession of the State of Junagadh, which had a Hindu majority, to Pakistan? What did it actually protest about? They said, and I quote from the telegram of the Governor-General of India addressed to the Governor-General of Pakistan on September 22, 1947:

"... Pakistan Government have unilaterally proceeded to action which, it was made plain, Government of India could never and do not acquiesce in. Such acceptance of accession by Pakistan cannot but be regarded by the Government of India as an encroachment on India's sovereignty and territory and inconsistent with friendly relations that should exist between the two Dominions. This action of Pakistan is considered by the Government of India to be a clear attempt to cause disruption in the integrity of India by extending the influence and boundaries of the Dominion of Pakistan in utter violation of the principles on which partition was agreed upon and effected.

"The possibility of Junagadh's accession to Pakistan Dominion in the teeth of opposition from its Hindu population of over 80 per cent has given rise to serious concern and apprehension to local population and all surrounding states which have acceded to Indian Dominion."

And, finally, if there was no question whatsoever with regard to the religious complexion of the population of the princely states, how does one understand the following account—given by no other person than Mr. V. P. Menon, the eminent official of the Government of India who was handling the accession of the princely states to India? On page 117 of his book, *The Story of the Integration of the Indian States,* Mr. V. P. Menon states:

"Lord Mountbatten made it clear that from a purely legal standpoint there was no objection to the Ruler of Jodhpur acceding to Pakistan; but the Maharajah should, he stressed, consider seriously the consequences of his doing so, having regard to the fact that he himself was a Hindu, that his state was predominantly populated by Hindus and that the same applied to the states surrounding Jodhpur. In the light of these considerations, if the Maharajah were to accede to Pakistan, his action would surely be in conflict with the principle underlying the partition of India on the basis of Muslim and non-Muslim majority areas, and serious communal trouble inside the state would be the inevitable consequence of such affiliation."

If a Hindu state wanted to accede to India, India invoked the principle of partition, namely, religious composition and geographical contiguity. When it is a question of a Muslim state acceding to Pakistan, India says that

the principle of partition does not apply to princely states. Surely some measure of consistency is essential in all human relations, whether individual or international. If so, how does the distinguished Education Minister of India expect us to regard his statement now that there was no question regarding the religious complexion of the population of the princely states? He states: "The question of religion did not come into play at all".

Did it not come into play with respect to Junagadh? And Jodhpur? And Hyderabad? It did. So, why should it not come into play with respect to Kashmir?

This third statement of the distinguished Minister of India is:

> "... there is no substance in the suggestion that the accession of Jammu and Kashmir was not complete and absolute because the people of that state had not been consulted nor been given opportunity to express their choice".

He adds later:

> "Jammu and Kashmir became an integral part of India when the Instrument of Accession was signed and accepted, and from that day till today it continues to occupy the same position *vis-a-vis* the Indian Union and no question can possibly arise of annexing Kashmir or further integrating it into the Indian Union. You cannot make more complete what is already complete."

I repeat:

"You cannot make more complete what is already complete". It sounds very nice. The key words here are "complete" and "absolute". Contrast these with the adjectives employed by the representatives of India in the past to describe this so-called accession. The representative of India said at the 463rd meeting of the Security Council, referring to the so-called accession of Kashmir to India: "It acceded tentatively in October 1947." The word here is "tentative", which is far from "absolute" and "complete". Then, again, if the accession was "complete" and "absolute" what did the Prime Minister of India say when he wrote to the Prime Minister of Pakistan on October 28, 1947—just after the so-called accession? He said:

> "In regard to accession also, it has been made clear that this is subject to reference to the people of state and their decision."

It was either absolute and complete or it was subject to reference to the people. The distinguished Minister of India says it was the one; the Prime Minister of India says it was the other: Whom is the United Nations to believe? Whom are we to believe? What does one make of this statement made by the Prime Minister of India on November 2, 1947:

> "Let me make it clear that it has been our policy all along that where there is a dispute about the accession of a state to either Dominion, the accession must be made by the people of that state. It is in accordance

with this policy that we have added a proviso to the Instrument of Accession of Kashmir."

If Kashmir is an integral part of India, what question is left to be adjusted and adjudicated between India and Pakistan? What is it that we have been negotiating about, and what is it that we can negotiate about now? May I here refer to the joint communique issued by the Governments of India and Pakistan at the conclusion of the bilateral negotiations which I conducted on behalf of Pakistan and which were held at the ministerial level between India and Pakistan from December, 1962, to May, 1963, for six months. The communique said, at the conclusion of the six months of talks on the Kashmir dispute, as follows:

"The two Ministers recorded with regret that no agreement could be reached on the settlement of the Kashmir dispute."

If Kashmir is an integral part of India, and if this integration is absolute and complete, what is this "Kashmir dispute", and what were we trying to settle? What agreement is there for us to reach? The distinguished Minister of India says, referring to Azad Kashmir, that it is "a part of territory which by international law is as much a part of Indian territory as Bombay or Delhi is". Not for the purpose of polemics but for the purpose of illustrating what the attitude behind this statement signifies for establishing peace in the region of India and Pakistan, let me quote another statement of the Prime Minister of India made in the Indian Parliament on June 26, 1952. The Indian Prime Minister said in his Parliament :

"In Kashmir, we have to deal with a very difficult and delicate situation, the decision on which ultimately lies with a few million people in Kashmir, not even with this Parliament.

"India is a great country and Kashmir is almost in the heart of Asia. There is an enormous difference, not only geographically, but in all kinds of factors there. Do you think you are dealing with a part of the United Provinces, or Bihar or Gujerat."

The United Provinces or Bihar or Gujerat are Indian states, and the Indian Prime Minister emphasizes that there is an "enormous difference" between these states and Kashmir. The position taken by the distinguished Minister of India here is that there is no difference and he states that Kashmir is as much a part of India as Bombay and Delhi.

In the context of the question of accession, the distinguished Minister of India stated that when India was partitioned, "a part of the country seceding" constituted itself into Pakistan, and he claimed:

". . . the present Government of India was the successor government to the Government of the . . . United Kingdom. Pakistan was a new state which came into existence."

May I remind him that Pakistan came into existence on the partition of the

sub-continent not as a new state but as a co-successor state, together with India, to the Government of the United Kingdom. The same excerpt which he has quoted from the Cabinet Mission's memorandum of May 12, 1946, speaks of "the successor Government or Governments of British India". This memorandum was published more than a year before partition. At that time, it was not certain that the sub-continent would be partitioned into two states; but this was a clear possibility. The Cabinet Mission's memorandum provided for this possibility and hence the reference to more than one successor government in British India.

It is true that Pakistan was admitted to the United Nations and other international organizations as a new state, but this was done by virtue of its express consent under the Indian Independence (International Arrangements) Order of 1947.

In all other respects the same order provided, as for instance, in regard to the rights and obligations devolving from treaties and international agreements to which undivided India was a party, that both India and Pakistan were to inherit these rights and obligations as successor states of the British Government of India. I would not like to take up the time of the Security Council to adduce further arguments in support of this submission. A reference to the preamble and the various sections of the Indian Independence Act of 1947 will make it clear that the Act speaks of "two Independent Dominions" to be set up in India to be known respectively as India and Pakistan as from August 15, 1947.

In passing, may I observe that paramountcy which ended with the entering into force of the Indian Independence Act of 1947 was not a doctrine of International Law, but *sui generis* and, according to British legal authorities, peculiar to the constitutional development of the British Indian Empire.

I pass over the account given by the Minister of India of the circumstances in Kashmir which formed the genesis of the dispute. I do so because the truthful and balanced account of these circumstances is on the record of the Security Council, set forth at length in its proceedings. I also do so because it is irrelevant whether one or the other account is true. In terms of the Charter and in terms of moral and legal obligations of states, the controversies which existed before the acceptance of an agreement cannot be revived in connection with the implementation of the agreement. Once the agreement is reached you cannot revive the controversy which led to the agreement. The controversy closes as soon as there is the agreement. In the Kashmir dispute, the allegations of aggression by the two parties against each other were debated in the council and with the commission before the resolutions of UNCIP were adopted. The adoption of these resolutions and their acceptance by the two parties evidently disposed of the contentious issues which existed prior to them. You cannot enter into an international agree-

ment and then refuse to implement the agreement on the basis of the issues which the agreement closes. The assumption that the UNCIP resolutions could not be repudiated by either party without dishonouring an international agreement and committing an act inimical to peace was confirmed repeatedly by numerous declarations made on behalf of the Government of India. The Indian representative, at the 608th meeting of the Security Council, said:

"We cannot be a party to the reversal of previous decisions taken by the United Nations Commission with the agreement of the parties."

At the 769th meeting of the Security Council, the representative of India said the following:

"I said the other day that this engagement bound our two countries...... I should like to say that there are three parties in this whole process. The Security Council is a party to the resolution of August 13, 1948......"

The same representative stated the following at the 773rd meeting of the Security Council:

"The resolution of January 17, 1948, and the resolutions of the United Nations Commission for India and Pakistan, the assurances given, these are all resolutions which carry a greater weight—that is because we have accepted them, we are parties to them, whether we like them or not."

This, in brief, has been the status of the agreement arrived at between India and Pakistan through the effort and authority of the United Nations. The obligatory character of these resolutions arose not only from the consent of the parties, but also from the fact that the agreement enshrined the principle of self-determination which is integral to the concepts of the Charter. It was further enhanced by the fact that it was only on the basis of the acceptance of the two resolutions that the cease-fire agreement was reached between India and Pakistan and the people of Kashmir who were fighting against the Indian army were persuaded to lay down their arms.

Now the representative of India affirms that the—

"......two resolutions of the Security Council dealing with plebiscite were conditional and contingent on Pakistan vacating its aggression and the condition has not been complied with. It is really more than a condition. It was the very basis on which these two resolutions were founded and that condition not having been complied with, and the basis having disappeared, these resolutions are no longer binding on us. In any case, by the passage of time and various factors intervening......they have become obsolete."

I have dealt, I hope sufficiently, in my statement to the Security Council on February 3 with this theory of passage of time to show how untenable it is. I shall not, therefore, dwell on the subject any further, apart from adding that to characterize the decisions of the Security Council as obsolete shows

what little importance India attaches to this extremely important organ of the United Nations.

The Government of India accepted the resolutions of the United Nations Commission of August 13, 1948, and January 5, 1949, providing for a cease-fire, a truce agreement, and a plebiscite in Jammu and Kashmir to determine the question of its accession to India or to Pakistan after this question of aggression had been considered. The question of a conditional and contingent acceptance of those two resolutions, therefore, does not arise. The Security Council is fully aware that Pakistan is not required by the terms of the two resolutions to make a unilateral and unconditional withdrawal of its military forces from the state. The withdrawals have to be reciprocal and synchronized in such a manner that at the end of the process, while all the armed forces of Pakistan have left the state, the bulk of the Indian armed forces have also vacated the state. The obligation of Pakistan to withdraw comes into force and operation only after the conclusion of a truce agreement under the resolution of August 13, 1948, which provides for a synchronized withdrawal in the manner and to the extent stipulated.

Who is responsible for the deadlock with respect to the truce agreement, that is, with respect to the demilitarization of the state? India balked at the synchronization of the withdrawal of the forces on the two sides. India withheld its co-operation in formulating a truce agreement. India refused to help in establishing conditions which would involve the complete withdrawal of the Pakistan forces from Kashmir. India rejected the proposal for stationing a United Nations force for the purpose. After doing all these things, India began to complain that the Pakistan forces had not withdrawn. Certainly it requires no deep knowledge of law, to quote the expression of the Education Minister of India, to understand that a party cannot challenge the binding character of an agreement by pleading its own failure to perform it.

India has always charged Pakistan with this responsibility for the deadlock, but has always refused to submit its assertion to an impartial investigation of facts, mediation, or limited arbitration. In my statement of February 3, I repeated the offer made by Pakistan to the Security Council in 1962, that if an impartial determination should show that Pakistan is in fact responsible for the situation, my government would rectify the default through the speediest method, at the earliest possible moment, so that the way may be opened towards full implementation of the resolution. The fact that India has rejected this offer shows that its accusation against Pakistan is only a pretext for continuing its unlawful occupation of the state and refusal to implement the right to self-determination to the people of Jammu and Kashmir.

But even if we might suppose for a moment, for the purpose of argument,

that there is some strength in this allegation of non-compliance by us, what is its effect? Any infraction by Pakistan cannot be allowed, in fairness, to rob the people of Kashmir of the right to decide their future which has been assured to them by the UNCIP resolutions. Surely, the people of Kashmir cannot be penalized for the faults of Pakistan.

If this consideration is pondered, it will be realized that the entire case of the Education Minister of India rests on the exclusion of the rights and interests of the people of Kashmir. He wants to convert the whole issue into a pseudo-legal one between India and Pakistan and make it void of all human and moral significance. I say "pseudo-legal" advisedly because, if the representatives of India were serious in formulating the legal issues implicit in the dispute, then they would also be prepared for their determination by a competent authority. But they merely try to give it a legal character in order to confuse issues and to divert attention from the rights and interests of the people of Kashmir. This reflection is sustained further by their repeated allegations of aggression against Pakistan.

What is there in this allegation which can be at all relevant to the solution of the problem from a human point of view? The question whether Pakistan did or did not commit aggression in Kashmir can be answered only by the people of Kashmir. For, if Pakistan did commit aggression in Kashmir, then evidently it was the people of Kashmir who were its victims. Surely, then, India should be insistent on an unfettered plebiscite in Kashmir which would enable the victims to return an overwhelming verdict against the aggressor. That it is Pakistan which seeks this plebiscite, and India which rejects it, shows how much truth the Government of India feels there is in its contentions. It proves which of the two parties bears the burden of guilt. Pakistan has nothing to hide; it is prepared to stand the light of day, which will be a clear and open ascertainment of the will of the people of Kashmir. It is India which seeks to ensure that that light should never dawn. But light will dawn.

In regard to the measures of annexation of the State of Jammu and Kashmir, to which I drew attention in my letter to the President of the Security Council of January 16, 1964, and in my statement of February 3, the distinguished Minister of India has extolled the alleged benefits that those measures would confer upon the people of Jammu and Kashmir. The point that I have the honour to make in regard to these measures is not whether they are a blessing to the people of Kashmir but that they are being imposed by an unlawful authority, in disregard of the injunctions of the Security Council, as set forth in the resolutions of the Council of March 30, 1951, and January 24, 1957. I would request the Security Council to note that the Government of India remains impenitent in regard to the further extension of such measures; and , on the contrary, as declared by the

Minister of India, it is set on imposing them.

This brings us to the heart of the problem with which, in our submission, the Council is faced in regard to the India-Pakistan question. On the one hand, the Minister of India says that "Pakistan has no *locus standi* whatsoever to make any complaint with regard to what India is doing in Kashmir", that "no amount of declamation from Pakistan will deter the Government of India" from proceeding to further implement its designs of annexation of the State, that the resolutions of the United Nations Commission for India and Pakistan "have become obsolete" and that the Government of India will "under no circumstances agree to the holding of a plebiscite in Kashmir".

On the other hand, he makes an offer to "discuss with Pakistan all our outstanding differences". The question is: How can the offer be taken at all seriously if the position of the Government of India is as the Indian Minister describes it? How can these differences be resolved if the Government of India maintains its rigid position, as it did during the bilateral negotiations of 1962-1963?

These negotiations failed, as did all other negotiations before. The Government of India says that mediation will not help. Now, the Minister of India adds that:

> "The passing of resolutions by the Council will not be helpful because it is likely only to aggravate feelings."

There is the further position rigidly taken by the Government of India that it will not agree to submit to limited arbitration the points of difference over questions of fact between the parties in regard to the implementation of the international agreement on Kashmir.

I would like to put the question before the Council: If negotiations have repeatedly failed and it is impossible for them to bear any fruit, if the Government of India is averse to mediation, if it rejects limited arbitration, if it warns against the Security Council's passing any resolutions, then is it not the position that all avenues of peaceful settlement are barred and closed to us?

This brings me to India's offer of a so-called "no-war declaration". We have said again and again that we have already signed a "no-war declaration" when we pledged our adherence to the United Nations Charter. The Minister of India asks if we have any mental reservations. Did India have mental reservations when it signed the Charter of the United Nations? If not, what is the necessity of a "no-war declaration". What is needed is not another declaration but to devise specific methods for the settlement of the Kashmir dispute. This would remove the sole cause of conflict between the two countries.

We have been trying to impress this point on the Government of India

since 1950, when we proposed a "no-war declaration" which would contain provisions for negotiations between India and Pakistan, and, in the case of the failure of negotiations, for recourse to mediation and, in the event of the failure of mediation, for the submission of the points of dispute to either an appropriate arbitration or judicial determination. To our regret, and to the misfortune of our two peoples and, above all, the people of Kashmir, the Government of India has persistently refused to accept our offer and to recognize that a "no-war declaration" is a mere platitude unless it is accompanied by a simultaneous commitment to the use of methods for a specific settlement of disputes.

While our position has been greatly misrepresented in the past, it is gratifying that the principles for which we have sought to gain acceptance are now finding expression in the dialogue between the heads of Governments of the United States and the USSR. In his recent statement regarding the peaceful settlement of territorial disputes, Chairman Khrushchev said:

> "Life shows that the majority of territorial disputes are fraught with the danger of complication of relations between the parties with the possibility of a serious armed conflict, and consequently constitute a potential threat to universal peace."

He added:

> "Is it that the Soviet Union proposes to cross out with one stroke all territorial issues between states, to abandon all attempts to settle them as if these issues do not exist at all? No, this is not the point. We realize that some countries have weighty reasons for their claims."

He continues:

> "A peaceful settlement of territorial disputes is also favoured by the fact that in the practice of international relations there already exists a store of improved methods of peaceful settlement of outstanding issues; direct negotiations between the states concerned, use of good offices, request of assistance from international organization, etc."

On this basis, Chairman Khrushchev proposed an agreement which should include "an undertaking to settle all territorial disputes exclusively by peaceful means, such as negotiations, mediations, conciliatory procedure, and also other peaceful means at the choice of the parties concerned in accordance with the Charter of the United Nations".

Let us take this statement of the Chairman of the Council of Ministers of the USSR and apply it to the Kashmir dispute, even though this dispute hinges on a people's right to self-determination. According to this statement, it is not at all justifiable to abandon all attempts to settle the dispute, as if it did not exist at all. But that is precisely what India seeks to have the Council do. According to this statement, there is to be an undertaking to settle the dispute by peaceful means. But after the failure of one

of these means, that is, negotiation, India blocks the other means. And still India proposes a "no-war declaration".

Let us now refer to the statement of the President of the United States made in his letter of January 20, addressed to Chairman Khruschev of the USSR, in which President Johnson proposes the following "guideline" to implement the principle of the renunciation of the use of force for the solution of international disputes:

> "The parties to any serious dispute shall seek a solution by peaceful means—resorting to negotiation, mediation, conciliation, arbitration, judicial settlement, action by a regional or appropriate United Nations agency or other means of their own choice."

How does this apply to the question before us? Since negotiation between India and Pakistan has failed, is India prepared for limited arbitration or judicial settlement of those points of difference between the parties which are either arbitrable or capable of being judicially determined? India has rejected these means again and again. India is even rejecting today the assistance of the United Nations in the settlement of this dispute. And yet India proposes a "no-war declaration".

The President of the United States adds in his statement:

> "The prevention of wars over territorial and other disputes requires not only general principles but also the growth and improvement of the machinery of methods for peaceful settlement. The United States believes that the peace-keeping processes of the United Nations—and specifically its Security Council—should be more fully used and strengthened."

It is these peace-keeping processes of the United Nations which India spurns with regard to Kashmir. When it came to the question of how the forces of India and Pakistan could be withdrawn from the State of Jammu and Kashmir, and the security of the state preserved, we proposed the stationing of a United Nations force which would be impartial to both, India and Pakistan. India rejected the proposal and threatened that any country which would attempt to inject a United Nations force in Indian-occupied Kashmir would be regarded as unfriendly to India. We went further and conveyed our acceptance to the United Nations representative in 1958 of his suggestion that the possibility of stationing a United Nations forecon the Pakistan side of the Jammu and Kashmir border be examined to ensure the security of the area after the withdrawal of the Pakistan forces. India said that it would "regret" the stationing of such a force in the territory of Pakistan. Thus India made it impossible to have recourse to the peace-keeping machinery of the United Nations for a solution of the Kashmir dispute. What is more, India obstructs even a resolution of this Council. And yet India proposes a "no-war declaration".

There is another important consideration involved here with respect to

this offer of India to "sit with us to resolve our 'differences'." Any impartial observer will note that the word "differences" is being advisedly used here. Its intent can be nothing but to confuse the issues. For, after all, what "differences" are there? There might be many minor differences between India and Pakistan, as there would be between any two neighbouring countries, but none of them has presented a major obstacle.

There is the question of the minorities, but it is evident that it is within the scope of the domestic responsibility of each government. The minorities in India can be protected only by the Government of India, and the minorities in Pakistan can be protected only by the Government of Pakistan. What room is there for any international mediation to bring about any tangible improvement in this regard? Apart from each government taking firm action to give its minorities the fullest sense of security, what is required here is co-operation between the two countries to enable the refugees to return to their homes. Even more, there should be an over-all improvement in the relation between India and Pakistan and the growth of fraternal spirit between Hindus and Muslims in the two countries.

But a lasting improvement in the climate can take place only with the settlement of the Kashmir dispute. India would evade this settlement and yet talk of resolving "differences". Its position is, I am constrained to say, so transparently disingenuous that it cannot possibly delude anyone.

The Minister of India professes not to believe the sentiments I expressed the other day regarding the peaceful settlement of international disputes. He accused Pakistan of indulging in threats of violence. The Kashmir dispute has been before the Council for sixteen long years. Numerous efforts have been made during these years to reach a peaceful solution of the problem. No less than twenty different proposals have been made at one time or another by eminent personalities, including the President of the United States and the Prime Minister of the United Kingdom, in order to bring about agreement between India and Pakistan. Every one of these proposals was accepted by Pakistan. Every one of them was rejected by India. If this does not constitute proof of Pakistan's willingness to seek peaceful settlement of disputes, then I am at a loss how to satisfy India.

It was the Defence Minister of India who declared in the General Assembly of the United Nations that India had not abjured the use of armed force and that it reserved the right to resort to force when its interests so demanded. It was the same Defence Minister who publicly described Pakistan as India's "enemy number one". We have come here not with a threat, but with an appeal—an appeal to you to remember that this organization was established "to maintain international peace and security, . . . to bring about by peaceful means and in conformity with the principles of justice and international law, adjustment or settlement of international disputes or situa-

tions which might lead to a breach of the peace". We appeal to you to remember that the history of mankind has been marked by war and violence, that if this organization in which men have placed their hopes for future peace turns a deaf ear to the pleas of the down-trodden, then what hope is there for peace in our time? For India, the situation is simple. It is in possession of the major part of the State of Jammu and Kashmir and would like nothing better than to be left alone. But we, seeing our kith and kin, our flesh and blood, suffer tyranny and oppression, shall we remain silent spectators? We, who can see and feel the surge of a people determined to be free, shall we not warn of the consequences and dangers of letting the situation drift like this?

The Minister of India has sought to put the blame on Pakistan for the failure of the bilateral talks which took place between our two countries in 1962 and 1963 because of the conclusion of the Sino-Pakistan boundary agreement. He goes on to charge that the talks were finally broken off by me in spite of all efforts on the part of his government to keep them going. Let me place the relevant facts before the Security Council.

In pursuance of the policy of the Government of Pakistan to promote friendly relations with all nations of the world, and in particular with those which are its neighbours, we concluded boundary agreements with Iran, Burma, and to some extent even with India.

It was in pursuance of this policy that the Government of Pakistan formally proposed to the Government of the People's Republic of China in March, 1961, that the two governments should enter into negotiation to reach an understanding on the location and alignment of the undemarcated border of the Chinese province of Sinkiang and the contiguous areas, the defence of which is the responsibility of the Government of Pakistan.

The Government of the People's Republic of China made an affirmative response at the end of February, 1962, and a few months later, in May, a joint communique was issued by the two governments stating that they had decided to enter into negotiations to reach an understanding on the boundary question on the basis of mutual accommodation and in the spirit of friendly relations between neighbours.

The negotiations commenced in Peking a few weeks before the outbreak of the Sino-Indian border conflict, in October, 1962. That was a conflict between two powerful nations of the East. That was a crisis which was not of our making. We could neither prevent it nor influence its course.

When the joint communique of the President of Pakistan and the Prime Minister of India was issued on November 29, 1962, agreeing to make renewed efforts to resolve the Kashmir dispute on a just and honourable basis, India knew fully well that Pakistan and China had commenced

negotiations on a boundary agreement in Peking much earlier. On the eve of the commencement of the bilateral talks in Rawalpindi, on December 27, 1962, complete agreement in principle between Pakistan and China on the alignment of the boundary between Sinkiang and the contiguous areas, for the defence of which Pakistan was responsible, was announced. We took this course before the bilateral negotiations with India commenced. Had we not done so, the Government of India would have accused us of withholding this information and thereby acting contrary to the spirit of the joint communique of November 29, 1962. The Peking negotiations took their course. I signed the agreement in Peking on March 2, 1963.

The Minister of India calls the conclusion of this boundary agreement a "provocation" and gives credit to his government for not breaking off the Kashmir negotiations with Pakistan. He accuses me of this action. In May, 1963, during the last round of talks, I repeatedly told the Indian Minister, Sardar Swaran Singh, the leader of the Indian negotiation team, that I would be willing to stay on in Delhi if he was at all prepared to consider the Pakistan suggestions to break the complete deadlock that had been reached since the third round. I got no response. Therefore the negotiations ended.

The Minister of India has thought it fit to accuse us of "flirtations with China" and that "Pakistan does not want India to be strong; it wants to weaken her both internationally and domestically". Mr. President, was this remark about "flirtations with China" meant for your ears? Was it meant for the ears of everyone in this Council? Obviously not. It was supposed to be a dialogue, but I should like to state here that no one in this Council is so innocent as not to know the difference between an ally and an opportunist. We are allies, we are committed in two defence alliances with our friends, and we stand by those commitments and alliances. We take the advantages and the disadvantages of alliances. We take the benefits and non-benefits of alliances. We are willing perhaps to face nuclear annihilation for a common cause and common destiny and common values. Perhaps one of the reason why no progress has been made in the settlement of the Kashmir dispute is because we are committed firmly to our alliances. No one then can delude anybody that Pakistan is flirting with Communist China. We have a boundary agreement with all countries, with Burma, with Iran. China happens to be our neighbour as well and, like all others, we have concluded a boundary agreement with them in the interests of peace and security and stability to remove all possible sources of friction so that peace is consolidated, so that there is not a repetition of the conflict that India is involved in with so many countries. This was in the interest not only of our alliances, this was in the interest of world peace. We have recognized reality; many countries have recognized the reality.

Have they been accused of flirting with Communist China? May we remind the representative of the Government of India of the ten years of seduction that took place between the Government of India and the People's Republic of China?

We here in this Council are accused of flirtations with a neighbour merely because we have normal relations, but no one in this Council is so naive as to be taken in by this propaganda of the Government of India, and those friends and allies of ours, whom we stand by firmly and resolutely, know it better than anyone else.

What is this flirtation, pray? When the Panchshila was proclaimed by India after it reached agreement with China over Tibet in 1951, as the magic formula which would ensure peace in the world in our time, that was not flirtation. If slogans of "Chini Hindi Bhai Bhai" rent the Indian skies for years, that was not flirtation. But no sooner does Pakistan conclude a boundary agreement with China in the interest of peace and tranquillity in Asia, that becomes a flirtation. It is obvious that India has a double standard of international conduct, one for India and quite another for Pakistan.

We are accused of weakening India domestically and internationally. I have dealt sufficiently with the domestic aspect. How have we weakened India internationally? Must we remain on unfriendly terms with India's neighbours because India's relations with most of them are unfriendly? It is not alone with Pakistan that India has differences, India has differences with almost all its neighbours. If it were only with Pakistan, then perhaps there may be some fault, some blame which could be apportioned or put on Pakistan. But apparently India is right in every case and the rest of the world—and in particular its neighbours—is wrong in every case.

We are accused of having given away to China as a result of the boundary agreement 2,000 square miles of Kashmir. I thank the Minister of India for reducing the charge to this more modest dimension. Immediately after the conclusion of the boundary agreement, the Prime Minister of India stated in the Indian Parliament on March 5, 1963 that Pakistan had "surrendered" 13,000 square miles of territory to China. Now we come down to 2,000 square miles. The fact is that Pakistan did not surrender a single inch of territory to the People's Republic of China.

The Chinese People's Republic relinquished to Pakistan in a spirit of mutual accommodation some 750 square miles of territory beyond the main axis of the Karakorum range—which constitutes watershed—that was in its *de facto* possession.

In the context of this debate, let me quote to you from Article 6 of the Sino-Pakistan Boundary Agreement:

"*Article Six:*

The two Parties have agreed that after the settlement of the Kashmir dispute between Pakistan and India, the sovereign authority concerned will re-open negotiations with the Government of the People's Republic of China on the boundary, as described in Article Two of the present Agreement, so as to sign a formal boundary treaty to replace the present Agreement, provided that, in the event of that sovereign authority being Pakistan, the provisions of the present Agreement and of the aforesaid Protocol, shall be maintained in the formal Boundary Treaty to be signed between the People's Republic of China and Pakistan."

This article is sufficient refutation of the Indian charge that Pakistan has altered the *status quo* in regard to the State of Jammu and Kashmir. It speaks for itself.

We now hear a new argument as to why Kashmir must be held in bondage by India regardless of the right of self-determination, and the solemn international agreement to which India is pledged. This is that Kashmir has now assumed vital importance to India's defence against China. Here, then, is a new doctrine. Self-determination and the sanctity of the international agreements must give way to considerations of military strategy. The distinguished delegate of India would have us believe that a single glance at the map would be sufficient to establish the validity of this doctrine. I would invite the members of the Security Council to respond to the distinguished Education Minister's invitation. It is not through Ladakh or the Vale of Kashmir that the security of India can be seriously threatened. In the name of defence, India seeks to negate the Charter by invoking the doctrine of real politik.

Then we are accused of carrying on a virulent propaganda against India in favour of China. Why? Are we expected to brand every country which has a dispute with India as guilty of aggression against India? India is one of the largest countries of the world. It ill becomes so large a nation to suffer from a victim-complex.

We ardently desire that India would compose her quarrel with her neighbours peacefully through meaningful negotiations. We have repeatedly urged that a peaceful, honourable and amicable solution of the border dispute between our two colossal neighbours should be reached. Our own self-interest dictates it. War between India and China would inevitably produce most serious and direct consequences for Pakistan.

The Representative of India has also asserted that the people of Kashmir were prefectly happy under the benevolent rule of India and should not, therefore, be given the right of self-determination. He told the Council that the revenue of the State of Jammu and Kashmir had increased ; so had food production. There were more schools, more hospitals, better roads, electricity and so forth, than there were ten years ago. This glowing report,

permit me to say, reminded one of nothing so much as an account given by a colonial power of its administration before the Trusteeship Council. The argument that the people are well fed and happy under foreign rule, that the benevolent ruler knows what is best for the people and that those who speak for freedom are disgruntled agitators is one with which this world organization is all too familiar. How many times have we not heard the Foreign Minister of South Africa stand at the rostrum of the General Assembly and extol, in terms of hospital beds, schoolrooms, roads, kilowatts, and megawatts the benefits brought about by his government to the indigenous people of South West Africa? Like the Minister of India, the Foreign Minister of South Africa too feels that if only his government were left alone, all would be well. He too would like the world to believe that those who decry the denial of human rights to the people of South Africa and South West Africa are agitators uninitiated in the ways of Christianity and democracy and secularism, and involved in an international conspiracy against South Africa and the peace of the world.

The number and diversity of reasons put forward by the Representative of India for not fulfilling the pledge given by his government are so great that it is not easy to follow the thread of his argument.

We have always considered Kashmir to be a vitally important question because it is, above all, a human question on whose just and honourable solution depends the fate and future of nearly 600 million people who inhabit the Indo-Pakistan sub-continent. It is the Indian pretension that Kashmir is a symbol and guarantee of their secularism. I venture to submit that Kashmir is a test of the ability of the world community to resolve disputes through peaceful means. If Kashmir is to be a symbol and guarantee, let it be the symbol of the willingness of nations to solve disputes through peaceful means and a guarantee that justice will be done to all states and all peoples, big and small.

The Kashmir dispute has dragged on for many years. The complexities that sourround it are the complexities of politics and power. The issue involved is simple and clear : the right of a people to self-determination and the obligation of states to honour international commitments. We heard a scholastic discourse the other day from the Education Minister of India on the meaning of the word "self-determination". To those of us in these halls who fought and struggled for this right, to those of us who symbolize by our presence here the triumph of this principle, the meaning of self-determination is quite clear. Pakistan is not playing with the idea of self-determination when it talks of Kashmir any more than we play with the idea when we speak of self-determination for Angola, Mozambique, Rhodesia, and South West Africa. "What is self-determination?" asked Mr. Chagla the other day, as if he were unaware of the commitments given by his

government to the people of Kashmir, to Pakistan, and to the Security Council. This is how the Prime Minister of India, his Prime Minister, answered the question on these three different occasions.

In 1947, in a broadcast to the Indian nation, Mr. Nehru said :

> "We have declared that the fact of the State of Kashmir is ultimately to be decided by the people of Kashmir. That pledge we have given not only to the people of Kashmir but to the world. We will not and cannot go back on it."

In 1951, in that unfortunate city of Srinagar in which blood is flowing at this very hour while we gather here, he declared:

> "I want to repeat that the Government of India will stand by that pledge, whatever happens. That pledge itself stated that it is for the people of Kashmir to decide their fate without external inferference."

Then, in the Indian Parliament, in February, 1951, the Prime Minister of India declared:

> "We have given our pledge to the people of Kashmir and subsequently to the United Nations. We stood by it and we stand by it today. Let the people of Kashmir decide."

The words are simple, their meaning clear—"Let the people of Kashmir decide". There is no equivocation here, no quibbling about what is self-determination, no fear that the unity, solidarity, and integrity of India was at stake.

Yet, now we are told that the right of self-determination is something the countries of Africa and Asia ought to fear. In his short lesson on the history of the United States, the Representative of India recalled for us the bloody Civil War fought in the United States to prevent the South from seceding. The analogy is inaccurate since Kashmir is not a part of India trying to secede, nor a slave-owning society attempting to retain slavery. Kashmir is an entity and a people, and to quote Mr. Nehru, it is a people with a soul of its own and an individuality of its own to whom the promise was made sixteen years ago that it would be free to decide its own future. The interesting and revealing feature of the analogy drawn by the Minister of India is that he obviously sees the situation in Kashmir as one in which an unwilling people have, by force of arms, to be held within the Indian Union for the fulfilment of some high and noble purpose of which India is the self-appointed instrument.

Mr. President, Pakistan has come here not to seek your support for the right of a minority to secede from the Indian Union. It comes to seek a reaffirmation of the pledge given to all the people of Kashmir that they will be enabled to decide the future of their land. The people of Kashmir are not an Indian minority. They will never be an Indian minority. Kashmir is not the property of either India or Pakistan. It belongs to the people of

Kashmir, and the people of Kashmir alone will decide as to what their future affiliation and course of action will be. The words I have just spoken once again are the words of the Prime Minister of India.

The Minister of India tried to raise the spectre of fragmentation of the states of Africa and Asia, many of which have minorities within their borders, if the principle of self-determination were to be applied. On previous occasions, Indian spokesmen have made a transparent bid for African sympathy by comparing Kashmir with Katanga. It would be naive for me to enter into this game, but let me say that if Kashmir is Katanga, then its despotic Maharajah, whose forefathers purchased the valley and its people from the British for a handful of silver, is the Tshombe of Kashmir.The Minister of India was outraged when I referred to the colonial nature of India's hold over Kashmir. Yet when we hear him hold forth on the complexities and dangers of self-determination, when we hear him extoll virtues of multi-racialism, do we not hear echoes of the sentiment expressed by President Salazar of Protugal in his declaration on Africa?

In his broadcast of August 12, 1963, Mr. Salazar asked the following question:

" If self-determination aims fundamentally at verifying the assent given to the form of state or of government under which populations live, it is not understood how there can be a single method of achieving this pupose or of determining that assent, the single method being a plebiscite following the illegitimate demands of the United Nations."

According to Mr. Salazar, Angola and Mozambique are an integral part of Portugal because Portuguese law says so, and any attempt to ascertain the wishes of the people of Angola and Mozambique is to be viewed as a dangerous negation of the noble and highminded policy of multi-racialism which Portugal has been attempting, for the last 500 years, to follow in Africa.

The Minister of India considers that the future of the world depends on the evolution of multi-racial nations and states in different parts of the world. Perhaps, that may be so ; it is not a contention with which we quarrel in principle. Pakistan itself is a country in which live people professing different faiths, speaking different languages, belonging to diverse racial origins.

Our difference on this matter with India—as with Portugal—is that we believe that the evolution toward multi-racial states and societies should come about not by force, not on the basis of legal fictions, but on the willing consent of the people. If this is a reactionary policy, then we plead guilty.

The Minister of India sought to enlighten us about India's crusade against imperialism and colonialism. His claims, I venture to submit, would

have been far more convincing if, in the same statement, he had not built his whole case regarding Kashmir on the rights of the ruler, a feudal chief, a tyrant who had been protected from his own people only under an imperialist dispensation. It is unfortunate for the Indian Minister's claims about India's anti-imperialist mentality that when he wants to prove Kashmir's affiliation with India, he cites the evidence that Kashmir was a part of the empire of Emperor Asoka.

Surely, not only Kashmir but the whole of Pakistan and most of Afghanistan were included in the empire of Asoka. And it is fatal for the thesis of the Minister of India that the political thought of modern India should have been articulated in different terms by her most prominent writers and authors. "The small national state is doomed" — these are not anti-colonialist words: they are the words of Mr. Jawaharlal Nehru in his book, The Discovery of India. And India's ambitions are well expressed by the distinguished Indian author and diplomat, the late Mr. K.M. Panikkar, who was India's ambassador and a very eminent Indian authority:

> "Our vision has been obscured by an un-Indian wave of pacifism. Ahimsa (non-violence) is no doubt a great religious creed, but this is a creed which India rejected when she refused to follow Buddha. The Hindu theory at all times, especially in the period of her historic greatness, was one of active assertion of the right, if necessary through the force of arms. To the Indian ocean, we shall have to turn, as our ancestors did, who conquered Socotra long before the Christian era, and established an empire in the Pacific."

The quotation is from his book, India and the Indian Ocean, page 16. Surely the attitude that is projected here is one of expansionism, an attitude that would extend India's hegemony from Somalia to Indonesia, and from the Hindu Kush to the Mekong River, that is, over all countries and territories touched by the waters of the Indian Ocean. It is, I submit, hardly an anti-colonialist attitude. Who has not heard of the epic freedom struggle of the peoples inhabiting the sub-continent? For long years, all of us fought side by side, although even while the struggle continued, the present leadership of India opposed, tooth and nail, the right of Pakistan to be a free and independent country.

It pains us, therefore, that a country so recently liberated from foreign rule should itself now employ the arguments and manoeuvres associated with colonial powers to deny the priceless gift of freedom to the people of Kashmir. The Representative of India stated that democracy, like charity, must begin at home. I would remind him that this is true of all virtue and that self-righteousness is no substitute for righteousness. He asserted that India has fought unceasingly in the United Nations for the cause of

freedom in Asia and Africa. I do not think that it is even necessary for me to remind the members around this table of the humble contribution that Pakistan itself has tried to make to the struggles of the peoples of Asia and Africa to free themselves from foreign domination. We take no credit for this. We seek no credit for it. It is our duty. It is our responsibility to world peace and to anti-colonialism. It is a natural thing ; it is not unnatural. It is a normal thing ; it is not a phenomenon. Nor do we wish to suggest that Pakistan's impact has been of a singular or decisive nature. The credit must go in every case to the peoples themselves and to their leaders who fought and struggled, even as the people of Kashmir are doing today.

How can India reconcile its record in Kashmir with the role it sees for itself as the leader, the prime mover, and the inspiration of freedom movements all over the world? Those of us who have worked in the United Nations on these problems know fully well the equivocations and hesitations of India whenever the question has come up of self-determination in any part of the world.

I am afraid that, in his zeal to contradict my statement, the distinguished representative of India forgot to read it carefully. He attributes to me some paeans of praise with regard to Sheikh Abdullah. Actually, though I cannot fail to admire the suffering and sacrifice of Sheikh Abdullah since 1953, the laudatory phrases about him that were contained in my statement were not mine: they came from the Prime Minister of India and they were all within quotation marks. If the distinguished representative of India contradicts them, he contradicts his own Prime Minister and does not contradict me. Then, he claims that the trial of Sheikh Abdullah has been with due process of Law. This claim can be judged from the following report published in the Times of London :

"In June, the senior prosecuting counsel, Mr. Pande, retired from the case. He said that the money for his fees could be better used. The trial, he said, could go on for another five to seven years."

It can also be judged from the letter addressed to the Prime Minister of India by fifty members of the Indian Parliament in September, 1963. The report of this letter, published in the Times of London, on September 30, said:

"In view of the adverse effect which the trial of Sheikh Abdullah and his associates was having overseas and of 'the colossal and abnormal amount believed to have been spent' on the case, this was the 'opportune and favourable time' for the withdrawal of the charges, the members argued.

"If the Government of India could find a graceful and politically safe way of withdrawing the charges against the Sheikh they would need

no urging by the opposition. Although the interminable proceedings in Jammu lend themselves to forgetfulness, they sit uncomfortably on Delhi's political conscience and, quite apart from the fate of the Sheikh himself, there are many who deplore the effect of this transparently political trial on the independence and self-confidence of the Indian judiciary.

"If Sheikh Abdullah could be brought to bind himself not to take up again the cause of an independent Kashmir or of a plebiscite to decide its future, Delhi might be pleased to release him. The Sheikh himself has said that he holds the key to his prison but will not give the assurances that are demanded. But the Sheikh released and calling for a change in the present status in Kashmir would be an upsetting influence, to say the least."

This, as I said before, is a report of the letter addressed to the Prime Minister of India by fifty members of the Indian Parliament.

The representative of India stated in his opening remarks that "no new situation has arisen to aggravate the existing conditions in Jammu and Kashmir". There is a no alien power occupying a territory against the wishes of its people which will ever admit the existence of a new or troubled situation in that territory. It would require high statesmanship and unusual admission of facts for India to acknowledge the present situation. What has actually been taking place in the last several weeks in the Indian-occupied area has been, in the words of President Mohammed Ayub Khan, "a spontaneous referendum of the people" in which the people returned an over-whelming verdict against India. Let me quote some further testimony on the new situation in Kashmir. The correspondent of the Times of London wrote from Srinagar, on February 2:

"Whenever crowds gather—and the sight of foreign correspondents, of whom there are only two just now, can be enough to attract a clamouring mob—shouts are raised for Sheikh Abdullah, for a plebiscite, and even for Pakistan . . ."

He adds:

" . . . but the affair of the hair has brought to the surface all the stored resentments of the Kashmiris and the crumbling of the local regime and its replacement by administrators and police from outside—"from India" as a Kashmiri would say—have made it likely that the resentments will now be focussed on Delhi. Discussion of the Kashmir problem in the past has always been comfortably informed with the belief that at least it would not be complicated by violent expressions of their own will by the Kashmiris. When the matter is before the United Nations again this week, it may have to be noted that there is a new factor in the old equation, the self-assertion of the Kashmiris."

There is a foreign observer talking of a "new factor in the equation", but

here we have the representative of India saying that there is no new situation.

Then there is the dispatch in the New York Times written from Srinagar on February 5:

"The Government of India was described today as 'completely out of touch with the real sentiments' of the people of the disputed State of Jammu and Kashmir.

"This was the view of several Kashmiri business leaders, including Hindus, in this predominantly Moslem region.

"According to these men, who asked not to be identified, 'since 1954 the Moslem majority of Kashmir has been pro-Pakistan'.

"Their view was completely different from that expressed yesterday by Mr. Lal Bahadur Shastri, the Indian Minister, after his return to New Delhi. Mr. Shastri said that the feeling in Kashmir was 'definitely pro-Indian'.

"The Kashmiri business leaders, however, insisted that most of the people here were pro-Pakistan."

Here is a record of the opinion in Kashmir which serves to refute the Indian representative's suggestion that the unrest is directed solely against local administration.

The correspondent of the Sunday Star, Washington, wrote on January 26:

"For four weeks now the Kashmiris, in an impressively discipline non-violent rebellion, have demonstrated their hostility toward closer links with India and their determination to decide their destiny.

"India's peace-making overtures and righteous indignation are not an effective substitute for the probably only lasting solution—finally granting the Kashmiris self-determination."

He added:

"The United States cannot now commit itself to a long-term arms aid to India within the next few weeks, as it has planned to, without seriously questioning the possible repercussions of what amounts to indirectly supporting India's virtual colonial overlordship of Kashmir."

In the same dispatch the correspondent says that "the Indian Government has not chosen to reveal a true picture of events in Srinagar". Considering that remark, it is not all surprising to hear the denial by the representative of India that there is no new situation in Kashmir.

There are further statements of foreign observers, for example, the report in the Baltimore Sun of February 5, which says "the hair, which Muslims believe came originally from the Prophet, is only a symptom of the problems in the Indian two-thirds of Kashmir", but I am forced to content myself with these in order to avoid undue length.

The representative of India has tried to make it appear that the theft of the Holy Relic was an isolated incident, and, with the alleged recovery of the Relic, the incident is closed.

While the Government and the people of Pakistan were gravely perturbed over this theft and take no position regarding the genuineness of its recovery, I must make it clear that it is the revelations brought about by this incident, rather than the incident itself, to which we are seeking to draw the Councils attention.

There is a significant report in the Times of India relating to the situation after what purported to be the exposition of the Holy Relic.

According to this dispatch from Srinagar, the President of the Action Committee said that the ban imposed by the Committee on the opening of shops on Fridays would continue until their demands had been conceded. It was after the recovery of the Holy Relic, again, that Maulana Masoodi, according to a Reuters dispatch, said that India-held Kashmir was "too much a police state with every Minister moving around with police protection", and not only did he demand the release of Sheikh Abdullah but also criticized the expulsion of Ghulam Abbas and Yusuf Shah, two Kashmiri leaders who, since 1947, have led the movement for the accession of Jammu and Kashmir to Pakistan. It is also after the recovery of this Holy Relic that reports continue of strikes in Srinagar, of the movement gaining momentum in other towns of Kashmir besides Srinagar, and of indiscriminate arrests.

In this connection, I must mention some recent utterances of Bakhshi Ghulam Mohammad who for ten years since 1953 was the so-called "Chief Minister" of Jammu and Kashmir and, therefore, India's main prop in the state. I have already quoted his statement of January 17, that the demands of the people of Kashmir were for the release of Sheikh Abdullah and the holding of a plebiscite. This statement was later "clarified" in a manner which furnished strong grounds for the belief that the 'clarification" was made under pressure. We have now a statement from him, which, according to reliable reports, still uncontradicted, was circulated in Delhi ; the statement says:

"Consequent upon the dismissal and arrest in 1953 of Sheikh Mohammad Abdullah because he had asked India to withdraw troops from Kashmir preparatory to holding of the promised plebiscite, I accepted premiership of the state as it was my honest conviction then that the majority community of Kashmir could be brought round to staying on with India and that they would really be better off and more secure with secular India than with communal Pakistan.

"For a full decade, I did all I could towards this end, but year after year I became wiser by observing that events in India reflected on the

psychology of Kashmiris."

He goes on to say:

"The recent episode of the Holy Relic at Hazratbal has extremely shocked sensitive Kashmiri Muslims who now openly declare that even their religion and culture is not safe with India. They also say that Pakistan is no more a Muslims State than India is a Hindu State, and the very fact that everything that befalls Hindus in Pakistan retaliates all the more severely on Muslims in India belies the claim of India to be a secular state —a state above religion. They fear their fate tomorrow will be no different from or not better than that of Calcutta Muslims.

"Of their three immediate demands, namely, the release of Sheikh Abdullah, the holding of a plebiscite and the inquiry into affairs that led to the events of 1953, I have already apprised the Press."

He goes on to say:

"I frankly admit that what Sheikh Abdullah said in 1953, I say today after a further ten years experiment. Even today I am honest and faithful to India and if it comes to a plebiscite, I might vote for India ; but to keep the Indian Government and the Indian people in the dark about the inner working of the mind of Kashmiri Mussulmans is a sin and a disservice.

"Many people may well call this statement of mine black-mail, but I make it clear, once and for all, that I am by no means eager or willing to become Premier of Kashmir again, and even if I am asked to, I will never accept that post ; nor do I oppose the change of the present government in the state, nor for that matter the establishment of President's rule or Sadar-i-Riyasat's rule, or whatever the Government of India and the people of Kashmir desire."

Bakhshi Ghulam Mohammad has up to now been one of the main instruments of India's designs in Jammu and Kashmir. A statement of this nature, coming from India's chief agent in the state, acquires a singular importance. We have reports that currently he is under extreme pressure from the Indian government and that he is either to be arrested and imprisoned—like his predecessor, Sheikh Abdullah—or forced to rescind his statements. A strong suspicion that the Government of India will mete out severe punishment to him for his audacity in confessing the facts about Kashmir is created by the statement of two former members of his government, Shamlal Saraf and Girdhari Lal Dogra, charging him with damaging the interests of India.

These are some of the facts which give an indication of the present situation in Indian-occupied Kashmir. If killing by police firing of scores of people, general strikes paralysing whole cities and towns, massive demonstrations by virtually the entire adult population of a capital city, sullen

resentment spontaneously expressing itself before foreign observers do not constitute a grave situation, then what will, except an outbreak of hostilities?

That it is the restraining hand of the Pakistan Government alone which preserves peace in Kashmir—all the charges against us levelled by the Indian representative notwithstanding—is apparent from the repeated demands made by the Azad Kashmir Government and the Jammu and Kashmir Muslim Conference for the abrogation of the cease-fire agreement. These demads are not lightly made. They are the spontaneous expression of the tension in Azad Kashmir which is a direct result of the repression under which the Indian-occupied and Indian-dominated area of Jammu and Kashmir groans.

The Indian representative denies the gravity of the situation and flings epithets at us of narrating "a horror story" and of being a victim of a "vivid imagination". If the evidence we have offered is not sufficient, let the Security Council employ whatever machinery is feasible for a thorough and impartial fact-finding of the situation in the Indian-occupied area of Jammu and Kashmir which should include taking the evidence of all political prisoners in the area. We do not see how the truth can be established except by an impartial inquiry ; in fact, we do not see how the Security Council can prevent a danger to international peace and security except by keeping the situation in India-occupied Kashmir under its constant and independent scrutiny.

We have drawn the Council's attention to the present situation in the State of Jammu and Kashmir and to the serious deterioration in the relations between India and Pakistan which is the direct consequence of that situation. In doing so, we believe we have done the duty that the Charter has imposed on us, the duty of seeking assistance of this world organization in ameliorating the situation, in arresting the deterioration, in preventing an accentuated conflict. Upon the assistance that the Council, in its wisdom and in its sense of the collective responsibility of mankind, will render us, rest the hopes for a peace in our region. We pray that these hopes may not receive a setback.

Address to the One Thousand One Hundred and Fourth Meeting of the Security Council on March 17, 1964

Mr. President,

I am greteful to you and to the other members of the Council for convening this meeting to resume the Council's consideration of the situation in Jammu and Kashmir and its grave repercussions on the relations between India and Pakistan. At the 1093rd meeting of the Council, I requested postponement of a few days in the Council's proceedings. My government deeply appreciates that this request was granted by the Council.

My purpose in addressing the Council again is, first, to give a brief account of the situation in Kashmir as it has developed since our last meeting and, secondly, to clarify my government's position in relation to the perspectives that emerged during the Council's discussion in February.

It will be recalled that the situation which we brought to the Council's attention had, as its immediate background, the announced intention of the Government of India to integrate Jammu and Kashmir with the territory of the Indian Union in violation of the international agreement regarding the state—an agreement binding upon both parties to the dispute. The announcement of this policy of the Government of India evoked the utmost resentment of the people of Jammu and Kashmir. The result was an outbreak of open rebellion against India in Kashmir.

After the Council had heard both parties, every member expressed deep anxiety for a prompt and peaceful solution of the dispute. An appeal to the two parties to refrain from measures which might aggravate the situation was clear in the statements made by the members of the Council without exception. It is my painful duty to report that this appeal has not been heeded by the Government of India. On the contrary, the Education Minister of India, in a statement of February 24, made in the Indian Parliament,

even tried to distort the statements of the members of the Security Council and interpreted them as conveying a tacit acceptance of further measures of integration of the State of Jammu and Kashmir into India.

Thus three facts have emerged during the interval since our last meeting. First, the movement of protest in the State of Jammu and Kashmir has continued. Secondly, India has shown no signs of relenting in its policy of repression against the people of the State. Thirdly, the Government of India has shown itself to be bent on adopting those very measures towards the annexation of the State against which Pakistan had specifically protested to the Council. Thus, during the interval, there has been no mitigation of the gravity of the situation between India and Pakistan.

Let me cite some important developments that have occurred since our last meeting. On February 20, India's Home Minister, Mr. Gulzarilal Nanda, indicated in the Indian Parliament that—

> "the special consitutional provisions that differentiated Jammu and Kashmir from other states of the Indian Union would soon disappear."

He added that "conditions as they had developed called for speedier action now."

On the same day, a correspondent of the London Times, reporting from Srinagar, said that Delhi would "cobble same arrangement" in Kashmir. The arrangement that was cobbled was the installation of a new puppet premier in Indian-occupied Kashmir on February 28. It is significant that this was done in defiance of the warnings given by saner elements within India itself. A prominent member of the Indian Parliament, Mr. M. R. Masani, stated on February 26, that—

> "replacing Mr. Shamsuddin with Mr. G. M. Sadiq as Prime Minister could not stabilize the situation in the State for long".

Indeed, the new puppet was installed even though the London Times reported on February 25—

> "resentment against Delhi's insistence on imposing him had increased considerably in Kashmir".

It is evident that Mr. Sadiq was nominated to head the Indian-sponsored regime in Kashmir because he had been demanding complete integration with the rest of India and the ending of Kashmir's special status. He fulfilled the expectations of his patrons by announcing on March 1 that his government would remove all barriers to the territory's integration with "the rest of India". To this end, the new Indian-sponsored regime in Kashmir introduced a bill in the so-called state assembly on March, 10, which seeks to change the designation of the head of state and the head of government of Indian-occupied Kashmir, and provides for replacement of the state flag by the flag of India.

India's new agent in Kashmir has gone even further and has called

for the appointment of the governor of Indian-occupied Kashmir by the President of India instead of his being elected by the state "legislature". The new cabinet includes a minister belonging to an extremist Hindu organization, whose avowed object is to convert Kashmir into a Hindu-majority area by violence and by large-scale immigration from India. Furthermore, key posts in the civil and police administration of Indian-occupied Kashmir have been turned over to non-Kashmiri officials. These include the post of chief secretary, to which an official of the Government of India has been appointed with full powers to fill other sensitive posts by the officials of the Government of India.

It is hardly necessary to explain at length the effect which these measures are designed to have. Their meaning is unmistakable. They are designed to carry out the annexation of the State of Jammu and Kashmir to the Indian Union. They are designed to destroy the identity of the people of Jammu and Kashmir. As I said in my statements in February, the question at issue is not what provision India should retain in, or eliminate from, its constitution. The question at issue is whether India intends to facilitate the exercise of their free choice by the people of Jammu and Kashmir or works to prevent it. Inasmuch as India, at an early stage, sought to give a symbolic recognition to the identity of the people of Jammu and Kashmir in Article 370 of its constitution, the abrogation of this article can be understood in no other light than India's intention to present the United Nations with a *fait accompli* and to try to close all avenues of escape for the people of Jammu and Kashmir.

We have protested to the Security Council against India keeping in gaol the accredited leaders of the people of Jammu and Kashmir. But what we are witnessing now is the wholesale imprisonment of an entire people and an attempt at reinforcing and multiplying the bars of steel behind which they have been encaged. Permit me to say that no act of the Government of India could be more calculated to serve as a grave provocation to Pakistan and to demonstrate complete defiance of the wishes of the United Nations for an amicable settlement of the dispute. Considering the timing and the rapidity of the execution of these measures for the integration of Indian-occupied Kashmir with India, how is it possible, I ask, for us to understand them except as evidence of India's determination to bring matters to a head and stage a showdown ? This is the situation that we are bringing to the Council's attention.

It will be recalled that, when we drew the Council's attention to the upsurge of popular feeling in Kashmir against India, the Indian representative emphatically replied that "the demonstrations in Kashmir were aimed at the local administration" and had no bearing upon Kashmir's relation with India or Pakistan. The question, naturally, arises: What is

the truth?

The truth could be found out by an independent fact-finding agency of the Security Council, if one existed, and my government would be under no necessity to elaborate the point further. In the absence of such an agency, however, one can only turn to the reports of impartial foreign observers. Out of the many which have appeared recently, I shall quote only a few. The Times of London, of February 13, for example, reported:

"Intense feeling in the Valley against the ruling party in the State has been projected against Delhi as well, and feeling there has probably never been more strongly against integration with India than it is now."

I might recall here that in my statements before the Council in February, I had said that it was the revelations brought about by the Hazratbal incident, rather than the incident itself, to which we were seeking to draw the Council's attention. All subsequent developments in Kashmir have borne out the truth of our submission. Here, for example, is a report in the New York Times of February 29, which says:

"The riots that followed the theft from a mosque of a hair revered as a relic of"—the Prophet—"Mohammed brought to light strong anti-Government feeling in Kashmir . . .

"New Delhi was alarmed by the pro-Pakistan sentiments of the people, which continued to be expressed after the relic had been restored."

Here is another report in the Evening Star of Washington of March 14, which says:

"India maintained that the popular uprising was directed against the local puppet government and did not express resentment against India itself. Weeks after tens of thousands of Kashmiris demonstrated in the streets of Kashmir's capital, Srinagar, demanding a plebiscite, independence or to join Pakistan. Prime Minister Nehru's new deputy, Lal Bahadur Shastri, told Parliament that the people of Kashmir welcomed full integration with India."

The correspondent then talks of "the cloud of gloom and despair" in the Kashmir Valley because of " a combination of armed police and imported Indian administrators", and then he adds:

"India now seeks a breathing spell to regain its shaky hold on Kashmir and wants time to absorb it gradually into India."

This testimony about the facts of the situation in Kashmir is further strengthened by reports in the Indian press itself. According to the Times of India of February 20, most of the shops in Srinagar remained closed on February 19 in response to a call given by the Action Committee for observance of a general strike as a mark of protest against the convening of the state assembly which "was not a true representative body". An article entitled "Inside Kashmir" by a columnist, Nandan B. Kagal, in the same

newspaper on February 26, said :

"Whether one likes it or not, the Action Committee set up by Maulana Masoodi after the Hazratbal theft has, within the space of a few weeks, seemingly become the voice of the people of the Kashmir Valley... It appears to have a wider popular base than any other political group in Kashmir today . . . It has called for Sheikh Abdullah's release and also for Choudhury Ghulam Abbas's return to Kashmir. When these demands are coupled with the allegation that the State Assembly does not truly reflect the will of the people of Jammu and Kashmir, the political objectives of Maulana Masoodi and the Action Committee become quite clear. Once the representative nature of the Kashmir Assembly is challenged, though its actions might remain legally valid, their meaningfulness in terms of democratic principles is reduced. Maulana Masoodi in effect says that Kashmir's accession to India is neither final nor irrevocable. . ." Then the Times of India on February 21 said that: "It is now quite plain that Maulana Masoodi and his colleagues on the Action Committee want to reopen the accession issue."

What clearer refutation, I ask, could emanate from India itself of the thesis advanced by the representative of India here that "the demonstrations in Kashmir were aimed at the local administration".

As a matter of fact, the latest reports leave one in no doubt about the nature of the popular movement in Kashmir. According to the Statesman of Delhi of March 17, the Action Committee in Srinagar, which has elsewhere been described as "the voice of the people", affirmed in a resolution on March 15 that the people of the State would not accept any solution of the Kashmir issue which is not based on the freely expressed will of the people, and called for immediate implementation in full of all pledges given to the people. They demanded the resolution of the dispute once and for all on the basis of a free and fair vote. The Kashmir Political Conference issued a statement on March 16 demanding that an appropriate atmosphere be established for the meeting of the leaders of India and Pakistan to solve the Kashmir question in accordance with the wishes of the people of Jammu and Kashmir.

The truth is that India knows fully well the reality of the people's movement in Kashmir and the cause of the continued crisis there. Yet, what is the response of the Government of India? It is to proceed with greater speed to integrate Kashmir into the Indian Union. It is to threaten stern action against anyone in Kashmir who stands in the way. When the Government of India threatens dire consequences for the people of Jammu and Kashmir taking the stand that they are entitled to decide their own destiny, it brings out the explosive nature of the present situation more clearly than it can be described. It shows that India, which is a member of

the United Nations, a signatory to the Charter, pledged to respect the authority of the Security Council, is prepared to persecute a people for no other act than their making manifest the demand that a principle of the Charter, and the decisions of the Security Council based on it, should be implemented in their case. Even if there had been no other disquieting factors in the present situation, this attitude of the Government of India would in itself be enough justification for Pakistan to seek the Council's intervention.

Actually, there are other disquieting factors which I have already reported. They emphasize the critical, cancerous nature of the present situation between India and Pakistan. The situation on the cease-fire line, always uneasy, is today more troubled than ever before. Serious incidents have taken place in recent weeks, leading to heavy exchanges of fire, resulting in a number of deaths. The urgency of the situation is as pronounced as it is poignant. There is no international agency but the Security Council which can meet it and thus help to avert the danger to peace which otherwise is being dangerously augmented by the day.

The danger to peace is indicated by the statements of responsible Indian spokesmen. On March 15, only a few days ago, India's Minister for Works and Rehabilitation, Mr. Khanna, said that "Pakistan is India's enemy number one" and urged Indian students to follow "the path of Shivaji and Govind Singh". These were war lords in Indian history who fought against the Muslims and who were defeated by the Muslims. These were the war lords to which the Indians referred during the Sino-Indian conflict. The Defence Minister of India has added to this statement that India will be "Pakistan's graveyard". Those are the words spoken by the Defence Minister of India the other day, that India will be "Pakistan's graveyard". While Pakistan, of course, remains unafraid of these threats, it is evident that they cannot be disregarded in an appraisal of the present situation.

The Council's consideration of the question in February helped to bring out again those aspects of the issue which, we believe, must not be obscured if a just and peaceful settlements is to be achieved. The pronouncements made by the members of the Council showed again that the United Nations is not insensitive to those principles upon which alone a structure of peace can be enduringly built.

The problem, however, remains that those pronouncements have to be brought to bear concretely on the situation which confronts us. One of the trends of the Council's debate has been to emphasize the necessity of resuming negotiations between India and Pakistan. I need hardly remind the Council that this advice is not, and could never be, unwelcome to Pakistan. Throughout the existence of the dispute, the Government of Pakistan has been anxious to utilize all reasonable methods for its peaceful

and equitable solution. When member states of the Council talk of negotiations between India and Pakistan, I would merely ask them to take into account our long experience of this particular method of trying to resolve the dispute.

There were conversations between the Prime Ministers of India and Pakistan even before the issue was brought to the Council in 1948. There was a long correspondence in 1950 and 1951, punctuated by personal contacts between the Prime Ministers of both countries, about formulating the principles which should govern the settlement of disputes between the two countries. There were negotiations again between the two Prime Ministers in 1953 and 1954. There were some direct talks in 1955. From 1958 to 1961 the President of Pakistan made sustained endeavours to secure a just and peaceful settlement of the dispute by direct negotiation. Then again, as the members are well aware, six rounds of talks were held between India and Pakistan from December, 1962, to May, 1963. It can, therefore, hardly be said that we have failed to explore the possibilities of this method, far less spurned it.

Since all direct negotiations between India and Pakistan so far have failed, we believe that it is necessary to bear in mind the reason for their failure. When one party refers to the governing principles of the case and the other relies on its might, when one seeks the reality of negotiation and the other wants only to contrive its semblance, when one seeks to expedite the process and the other is determined to stall it, what is the result? The inevitable result is that the parties talk at cross purposes with each other. There is then nothing to prevent negotiations from not only being wasteful but, through their futility, from worsening a tense situation. Even mediation does not help greatly in such a case, unless the mediator is in a position to direct the negotiations and to relate them to a framework which is reasonably precise. That alone can give the negotiations some coherence and purpose. To ask a mediator to assist in achieving a solution without a defined basis is to place an unfair burden on him.

It was said in this Council in February that the negotiations required in this debate should be constructive and sincere. But the problem is, how do we make the negotiations with India constructive and sincere, if the Indian position is that which was stated in the Council? What promise of success can we discern when the Education Minister of India, reporting the Council's proceedings to his Parliament on February 24, said :

> "I think we have laid the ghost once and for all for the holding of a plebiscite in Kashmir."

This kind of statement is probably an apt reminder to the Security Council that no formula for negotiations can help if it is vague and if it lends itself easily to distortion. Given the authority of the United Nations

and his personal standing, the mediator's good offices will certainly be a positive element. But this element, in order to be constructive, needs a foundation and a base. It needs precise terms of reference that can be objectively commended.

What point of departure can be more objectively commended than the principles of the Charter and the international agreement which has been solemnly accepted by both parties? This agreement was not imposed by the Council. It is based on the common denominator between the declared standpoints of the parties and, in itself, embodies a compromise between their respective claims. It is an agreement to which the Security Council itself is a party and to whose clarification it has devoted the thought and effort of scores of its member states and the eminent individuals who have served as United Nations representatives in the Security Council.

That the agreement embodied the pledge given by India and Pakistan to the people of the State is a fact which has been constantly affirmed and reaffirmed by the Security Council. Thus, the agreement has had behind it the recognition of all members of the United Nations. If anything was wanting in making this recognition universal, that, too, has now been done.

I must, in this context, stress before the Council that plebiscite in Kashmir is not just a slogan of Pakistan. It is not any consideration of prestige which attaches us to the international agreement on the State of Jammu and Kashmir, that is the two UNCIP resolutions. We invoke the principle of self-determination because it is the only basis—I repeat, the only basis—on which a solution of this problem can endure. Let us keep in mind the nature of this problem. It is not the problem of a border. It is not a dispute over a piece of territory. It is not a clash of economic interests. It is not a rivalry between two systems. It is the problem of the life and future of nearly 5 million people who inhabit a territory six times as large as Switzerland. In this day and age, how can we possibly dispose of this problem without impartially consulting the wishes of these people? Whether from an ethical or from a political point of view, there is no getting away from the fact that no solution of this question will be viable if it is arbitrary and if it is not based on, and sanctioned by, the freely-expressed will of the people concerned.

Suppose, in a mood of real politik and mindful only of the changing expediencies of politics and power, we were to try to hustle through what is called a political settlement. Is it a likely proposition that this settlement will be conducive to peace if it is opposed by the people involved? It is natural that some men of goodwill should feel the need for a fresh approach to a problem that has persisted for sixteen years. But—and here is the cold fact of the matter—no fresh approach is likely to be anything

but perverse if it dose not have the support of the people of Jammu and Kashmir. That is why we remain unshaken in our conviction that any deviation from the principles of the two UNCIP resolutions will result not in an easement of the problem, but only in its aggravation.

We have grappled with this question all these years and one thought abides with us. Suppose the slate were sponged clear and you were to consider the problem as if it had arisen now, not in 1948, but today. What would happen? In your search, however pragmatic, for an equitable settlement, you would be driven to the conclusion that there is only one sure way—the way of finding out what the people of Jammu and Kashmir themselves want. You would thus be driven to write again the substance of the UNCIP resolutions.

At the Council's meetings in February, it was one of the stark statements of Indian representative that the UNCIP resolutions are obsolete. I would like to raise two questions. The first is general. If these resolutions are obsolete, does that mean that the people of Jammu and Kashmir are also obsolete and that their right of self-determination is also obsolete? The second question is one of even more urgent implications and it needs to be concretely answered by the Security Council, on the one side, and by India, on the other. The question is this : if we accept the position of the Government of India that it regards these resolutions as obsolete, then does it not follow that the cease-fire in Kashmir is also obsolete, because there is no other sanction behind the cease-fire than the validity of these resolutions and their acceptance by India and Pakistan? It is evident that this is not a rhetorical question and we do not ask it in order to score a point. On the contrary, consequences of an extremely practical nature will flow from the answer that will be given to us by the Government of India.

We have been gratified by the references made in the statements of the members of the Security Council to the realities of the situation. We welcome the suggestions that a solution must pay due regard to these realities. So the people of Jammu and Kashmir are not any less of a reality today than they were in 1949. Will this statement be contested? The primary reality of the situation is the fact that, all passage of time notwithstanding, these people are not reconciled to Indian occupation. The primary reality is their frustration and discontent. The primary reality is their revolt. And the direct consequence of this reality is the fact that the dispute over Kashmir has brought about a threatening confrontation between India and Pakistan. The reality is that there has never been a time when the strain of the dispute in the entire India-Pakistan situation has shown any sign of being eased or when the tensions that it engenders have relapsed.

It is to these realities that the efforts towards the peaceful solution of this

problem have to be oriented if they are to bear any fruit. No so-called fresh approach can discover a substitute for a people's right to self-determination. No fresh approach can improve upon the substance of the UNCIP resolution which is the ascertaining of the popular will in Jammu and Kashmir without coercion, corruption, or interference from outside.

These are the considerations that must govern any endeavour towards a settlement, if that endeavour is really a serious one. While there is no doubt that they have been implicit in the thoughts expressed here in the Council, the situation in Jammu and Kashmir demands suitable international action based on them. When I say that this action has been lacking, it will, I hope, be understood that I am not unappreciative of the efforts made by the members of the Security Council during the series of meetings in February to bridge the gulf between the parties. It is, however, discouraging that the spokesmen of the Government of India should have lost no time in distoring the expressed views of the Council members and in questioning the very basis of a consensus. This attitude underlines the necessity of the Council to adopt a precise and concrete formula for setting in motion a process that will result in an amicable and honourable settlement of the dispute. We do not deny the value of appeals and exhortations. But it is essential that an appeal should constitute an adequate response to the urgent demands of the present situation. A suggestion to the two parties to negotiate is nothing more than an exhortation, unless some insurance is provided for the negotiations to be meaningful. I am certain that there is no member of the Security Council who will be satisfied by the parties merely going through the motions of negotiations and, as a result, increasing a dangerous feeling of futility in Jammu and Kashmir and in India and in Pakistan.

We have come here again to offer our co-operation to the Council for the betterment of the situation between India and Pakistan. While we appreciate the spirit of the agreed opinion of the members of the Security Council and endorse its contents, we beg to remind the Council that this opinion needs to be clothed in such form and conveyed in such terms as will tangibly help to move the problem towards a just, a peaceful, and an honourable settlement of the dispute of Jammu and Kashmir.

Address to the One Thousand One Hundred and Twelfth Meeting of the Security Council on May 5, 1964

Mr. President,

Since the present series of meetings of the Security Council began in February, I have had the occasion from time to time to apprise the Council of the situation prevailing in the State of Jammu and Kashmir. When the Council adjourned on March 20, at the request of the Indian representative, members of the Council made an appeal to both parties to refrain from any measures that might aggravate the situation.

The very fact of the question being before the Security Council has had some restraining effects on various forces that would otherwise have made the situation in Kashmir even more explosive than it is today. Yet the melancholy fact remains that the Government of India has not made any positive response to the pronouncement made here in the Security Council. Thus the situation in Kashmir remains highly disquieting and disturbed. In my statement to the Security Council on March 17, 1964, I stated that three striking facts had focussed world attention during the preceding thirty days:

> "First, the movement of protest in the State of Jammu and Kashmir has continued. Secondly, India has shown no signs of relenting in its policy of oppression against the people of the state. Thirdly, the Government of India has shown itself to be bent on adopting those very measures towards the integration of the State against which Pakistan had specifically protested to the Council."

The statement of mine is as true today as it was when we met six weeks ago, notwithstanding the release since then of Sheikh Abdullah.

On April 8, Sheikh Abdullah was released from jail. The conspiracy case

against him was withdrawn. It will be recalled that after some five years of incarceration without any trial whatsoever, Sheikh Abdullah and his principal lieutenant, Mirza Muhammad Afzal Beg, and twenty-four others, were brought to trial in May, 1958, on trumped-up charges of conspiring with Pakistan to bring about the secession of the State of Jammu and Kashmir from India. The trial dragged on drearily.

The fact that these charges had been fabricated and were totally false is now sufficiently known. The very withdrawal of the case against Sheikh Abdullah implies a clear admission that the charges were utterly baseless. Public opinion throughout the world has been outraged by this high-handed attempt to destroy the Kashmiri leadership politically. It was a part of a policy of terror and oppression to deny to the people of Jammu and Kashmir their right of self-determination.

A prominent Indian journalist, writing in the *Hindustan Times* of Delhi of April 8, has this to say of the Abdullah trial:

> "Sheikh Abdullah, on trial on charges which everyone recognized were bogus, had become the totem figure of the long, dark night of the Indian rule. The night has ended. Much had changed since then. Much more was changing, but so long as Sheikh Abdullah remained in jail, there was no promise that what the horrible night was giving place to was a clear day."

To those who have followed the course of what foreign observers have called an "open rebellion" by the people of Kashmir against Indian domination, especially after the Hazratbal incident of December last, the acquittal of Sheikh Abdullah has come as no surprise. Whatever the reason for this belated action, there is no evidence that it signifies a change of heart on the part of the Government of India. Neither does this appear to have been animated by a desire to seek a peaceful and honourable solution to the Kashmir dispute.

It is quite to the contrary. The rebellion of the people of Jammu and Kashmir under the leadership of the People's Action Committee, the Plebiscite Front, and the Political Conference had reached such a dimension and intensity that it had become impossible for the puppet government of Indian-occupied Kashmir and the Government of India to control the course of events in the State.

This is borne out by a correspondent of the *Daily Telegraph* of London of March 31:

> "There (in the Vale of Kashmir), the Action Committee, which demands a plebiscite for Kashmir, has shown itself virtually in control of the population while the National Conference, whose election to office is said by India to obviate the need for a plebiscite, looks on helplessly."

The same correspondent goes on to say:

"More dangerously, it does not seem to worry the Government (of India) that Mr. Sadiq, who has shown himself a loyal pro-Indian, does not control the Vale of Kashmir."

Members of the Security Council would doubtless wish to know why I maintain that the Government of India has shown no signs of relenting from its policy of oppression against the people of the State of Jammu and Kashmir.

In my statement to the Security Council on March 17, I invited the attention of the Security Council to the historic resolution of the People's Action Committee, adopted two days earlier in Srinagar, affirming that the people of the State would not accept any solution of the Kashmir issue which is not based on the freely expressed will of the people of Jammu and Kashmir.

Let me quote from this momentous resolution of the Action Committee:

"... the promises made to the people of Kashmir should be fulfilled by holding a free and impartial plebiscite so that the problem of Kashmir is solved once and for all.

"We declare that it is the firm and unshakeable decision of five million inhabitants of the state that this is our country; we will decide its future on the principle of self-determination through a free and impartial plebiscite. We are not prepared to accept any other solution. Now, the time has come that without any further delay steps should be taken to decide the future of the people of the State through a free and impartial plebiscite...

"Again, when the problem of Kashmir is now under discussion in the Security Council, the people of the State, with one voice, demand that, in accordance with the previous resolutions, immediate steps should be taken so that five million people of the State may exercise their birthright of self-determination."

The Kashmir Political Conference issued a similar statement the following day, urging that an appropriate atmosphere be created for the meeting of the leaders of India and Pakistan to solve the Kashmir question in accordance with the wishes of the people of Jammu and Kashmir. Maulana Masoodi and Maulana Farooq, two important leaders of the Action Committee, endorsed these demands. These caused consternation in political circles in India because they signified a categorical rejection of India's claim that the State had finally acceded to India.

After eleven long years of imprisonment, the Government of India has released Sheikh Abdullah. Abdullah is a free man because it was the universal and uncontrollable demand of the people of Jammu and Kashmir.

Abdullah is out of prison because the political organizations in the State, voicing the will of the people of Jammu and Kashmir and articulating their aspirations, forced the Government of India to open the prison gates. Abdullah has been set free because the National Conference, the corrupt and discredited ruling political party, collapsed completely. Abdullah is with his people again because of the virtual repudiation of the authority of the puppet Sadiq regime and the consequent administrative paralysis in the State of Jammu and Kashmir. The compulsion of events and forces drove the Indian government to withdraw the fake case against Sheikh Abdullah and his colleagues. No, it was not out of magnanimity or out of free will that the Government of India released Sheikh Abdullah from his eleven long and tragic years of imprisonment. Since last December, two demands have resounded throughout the state: "Release Sheikh Abdullah", and "Hold plebiscite in Jammu and Kashmir". Unable to stem this flood-tide of public opinion and increasing unrest in the state, the Sadiq regime had no option but to open the prison gates, and set Abdullah—that Lion of Kashmir—free. The *Hindustan Time*, Delhi, of April 22, reports Mr. Nehru as saying that circumstances in Kashmir were such that there was no alternative to releasing Sheikh Abdullah.

The *Statesman* of New Delhi wrote editorially on April 15:

"A movement to demand the release of the Sheikh was already building up a few weeks ago. In the first few days of this month it became clear that it would gather greater momentum, would command much broader allegiance. If the movement had become a fact, the only alternatives would have been either to yield to it—much worse than anticipating it—or to crush it without qualms of conscience and take a road leading to wholly unlikeable ends."

The *Economist* of London of April 4, commented as follows:

"Sheikh Abdullah, the former Prime Minister of Kashmir, has spent longer in prison under Mr. Nehru's rule than the latter did under the British. The Indian Government has not had a sudden rush of liberalism to the head; it has been forced by events to take a political risk for fear of worse; a risk which has happened so often to the British, it may now regret not having taken it sooner.

"Effective civil authority in the Kashmir Valley has been assumed by an unofficial 'Action Committee' which moved from demanding Abdullah's release in February to openly demanding a plebiscite by the middle of March. There is no question of Abdullah at liberty creating a popular demand for a plebiscite if he chose to. It exists whether he wants it or not."

Sheikh Abdullah's voice, silenced for more than a decade, speaks again. It echoes the demand of the people of the State for self-determination,

for a plebiscite, for negotiations between India, Pakistan, and the Kashmiri leaders to restore communal harmony, peace and amity between the peoples of the sub-continent by settling the dispute of Jammu and Kashmir. This voice has disturbed the recalcitrant elements in India. Within a few days of his release, threatening statements were issued by the leaders of India, both inside and outside the government, that if Sheikh Abdullah does not desist from this demand, his days of personal liberty may be numbered.

Let me quote some of the statements of the Ministers of the Government of India, Members of the Indian Parliament, leading public men, and newspapers on this subject. Mr. Lal Bahadur Shastri, Minister without Portfolio, stated in the Indian Parliament on April 11:

> "There could be no freedom for preaching some kind of independence or secession from India."

He repeated this threat on April 27.

Addressing a news conference at Patna on April 13, the Minister of Education for India, Mr. Chagla—who is sitting opposite me—declared:

> "The law will take its own course if Sheikh Abdullah preaches secession of Kashmir."

Mr. C. G. Deshpande, President of the Hindu Mahasabha, a fanatical Hindu political organization, considered that Sheikh Abdullah's release and the pronouncements which he made were a threat to India's integrity and security.

Mr. Deen Dayal Upadhaya, the General Secretary of the Jan Sangh, a militant Hindu organization, accused Sheikh Abdullah of playing the game of Pakistan and called upon the Government of India to adopt a firm policy in regard to Kashmir.

Mr. V. K. Malhotra, another Jan Sangh member, referring to Sheikh Abdullah's speeches, declared that anyone who said Kashmir was not a part of India should be treated as a traitor.

Mr. N. C. Chatterjee, a Member of the Indian Parliament, asked:

> "When an Indian citizen is charged with high treason and under trial for five or six years is released, where stands the rule of law?"

Turning now to the Indian press, the *Times of India* of Bombay, in its leading article of April 11, wrote:

> "The Government of India cannot hope to maintain its claims to the State as an integral part of India and, at the same time, allow men with a martyr's halo around their heads to carry on a campaign rejecting this claim."

In a second editorial comment on April 16, the same newspaper wrote:

> "Sheikh Abdullah is now a demagogue at large and he is plainly engaged in secessionist political acitivity. Mr. Shastri and Mr. Chagla have done well to warn Sheikh Abdullah on behalf of the Government of India

that if he continues to challenge the validity of the accession he will be dealt with under the law of the land like any other citizen of this country. If he chooses to ignore the warnings—and he has already described it as a threat which he will not submit to—and continues to adopt a secessionist posture, the Government of India must not hesitate to arrest him again."

Again on April 27 the *Times of India* in its panic, commented editorially:

"If Sheikh Abdullah is not silenced after his meeting with Prime Minister Nehru, he should be dealt with under the law."

The *Patriot* of New Delhi, in its issue of April 15, even went to the extent of demanding that to deal with the situation created by Sheikh Abdullah's pronouncements, the President of India should declare an emergency in the State of Jammu and Kashmir and assume to himself all powers of government, all dictatorial powers; in other words, the State of Jammu and Kashmir should be annexed outright by India.

Sheikh Abdullah's rejoinder is characteristic of him. Speaking to a gathering of 100,000 people in Anantnag on April 27, he asked:

"If I am re-arrested and put in prison again, will the Kashmir issue be solved ?"

The audience of 100,000 people all shouted in unison: "No, never." This is from the *Statesman* of New Delhi of April 29.

In a score of speeches that he has delivered since his release on April 8, the Sheikh and his close comrade, Mirza Mohammad Afzal Beg, have dealt with all the issues which lie at the heart of the Kashmir dispute. Emphasizing the need for a peaceful settlement of the Kashmir dispute between India and Pakistan at a press conference and a public meeting in Jammu on April 9, the Kashmiri leader made a number of important points: First, that the only alternative, a clash of arms between India and Pakistan, would be suicidal, especially for Kashmir, because, he said, "bombs will fall here, not in Madras or Karachi."

Secondly, he argued that, apart from other irritants, the continuance of the Kashmir dispute was a source of bitterness which lay at the root of every communal conflagration which threatened to destroy both countries.

At the same meeting Mirza Afzal Beg asked:

"If Mr. Swaran Singh and Mr. Bhutto could sit down for six months to solve the Kashmir dispute, why should he or anybody else be branded as a traitor for saying that the dispute existed?"

On the right of the people of Jammu and Kashmir to self-determination, Sheikh Abdullah has been forthright and uncompromising. Speaking to more than 20,000 people in Jammu on April 9, he declared emphatically that it would be wrong to claim that the people of Jammu and Kashmir had already exercised their right of self-determination through three general

elections, when the truth was that all three elections had been rigged. This charge, he said, was not only by him but also by all opposition parties in Jammu and Kashmir, including the Jan Sangh, an extremist Hindu organization, led by Mr. Prem Nath Dogra.

Later, speaking in Doda, a town in the province of Jammu on April 15, Sheikh Abdullah said that the argument that the people of Kashmir had exercised the right of self-determination by electing a constituent assembly was besides the point because elections were not held on the issue of accession. He added that the elections were rigged, even according to Premier Sadiq when Mr. Sadiq was the leader of the Democratic National Conference.

On April 17, the Kashmiri leader declared before a gathering of over 100,000 people in Anantnag that there should be no doubt that the Kashmiris would not rest content until their right of self-determination was conceded. Neither with the help of the army nor by repression could the people's determination be crushed or their right to demand a plebiscite be suppressed, according to Sheikh Abdullah as reported in the *Hindustan Times* of Delhi on April 18, and not the *Pakistan Times*.

On April 18, Sheikh Abdullah stated at Pampore that India's claim that Kashmiris have decided their future was fantastic. They had never exercised the right of self-determination.

He asked the United Nations, which he termed as the world's conscience, why it had not helped the people of Kashmir to secure the right of self-determination after India and Pakistan and other world powers had pledged themselves to allow the Kashmiris to exercise it?

In statements and speeches on April 23 and April 24 in Srinagar, Sheikh Abdullah repeated that the people's demand for self-determination must be met. And, the important point to note is that wherever he spoke of this demand, his Kashmiri listeners endorsed it with acclamation and the highest enthusiasm.

On India's claim that the accession of the State of Jammu and Kashmir to India is final and irrevocable, Sheikh Abdullah was categorical:

> "With reference to the Indian contention that the constituent assembly of Kashmir had ratified Kashmir's accession to India, he stated in Jammu on April 10, that this was not correct. The constituent assembly had taken a decision on accession, he said, after he, its founder, had been imprisoned with his comrades, and other members had been bribed or coerced."

Sheikh Abdullah added that he was hurt that the country of Buddha and Gandhi relied on false arguments, and even argued that, since circumstances had changed, basic principles should also change. (*Statesman*, New Delhi, April 12).

Speaking in Doda, another town in Jammu, on April 14, Sheikh Abdullah, in a sharp rejoinder to the Education Minister of India, Mr. M. C. Chagla, said that the Indian constitution recognized the provisional character of Kashmir's accession. He further pointed out that the constituent assembly, according to the late Sir. B.N. Rau's statement in the United Nations Security Council, had no right to decide on the accession issue.

On April 17, he declared before a crowd of 100,000 people in Anantnag:

"The eyes of the world are seeing that the Kashmiri people reject the Indian claim that Kashmir's accession to India is final.

"To repeat that Kashmir is an integral part of India is utter nonsense."

On April 20, speaking in Srinagar to a mass meeting of over 150,000 people, Sheikh Abdullah said:

> ". . . we challenge the Indian assertion that the question of Kashmir's accession has been settled 'once for all and Kashmir is as good a part of India as Madras or Punjab'."

Reminding Mr. Nehru of his promise in 1947 that "Kashmir's future is the concern of Kashmiris alone," Sheikh Abdullah said:

> "This is a promise given to us by the Security Council as well and we want its implementation."

On the question of holding a plebiscite in Jammu and Kashmir as pledged to the people of the state, Sheikh Abdullah has also defined his stand:

> "On April 18, he said at Pampore that the demand of the people of Kashmir was an 'impartial plebiscite'. No one could deprive them of this right. He added that India, Pakistan and the United Nations were committed to an impartial plebiscite and the people of Kashmir could not be cowed down by suppression." (*Hindustan Times*, Delhi, April 19.)

On April 20, Sheikh Abdullah's prominent comrade, Mirza Afzal Beg, when asked in Srinagar whether the plebiscite demand had lost its importance, disagreed and said that the plebiscite was a human right which must be respected.

On India's contention that passage of time had rendered the principles of the UNCIP resolutions obsolete, Sheikh Abdullah had this to say on April 9, in Jammu, the very next day after his release from prison:

> "Principles could not change merely on account of passage of time . . ."

Turning to the measures taken by the Government of India to "integrate" the State of Jammu and Kashmir with India, Sheikh Abdullah warned:

> ". . . the demand for closer integration with India would not help preservation of unity in the State". He added that "the Kashmiri Muslims do not want to be integrated. Even the Indian army could not force them to do so".

These statements of Sheikh Abdullah reflect the will of the people. Sheikh

Abdullah is right when he says that there will be no acceptance of the *status quo* by Pakistan or by the people of Kashmir. And he is right when he says that the future of the state must be decided in accordance with the wishes of the people of the state.

Urging the solution of the Kashmir problem, Sheikh Abdullah said in Jammu on April 9 that:

> "Kashmir continued to be a dispute poisoning India-Pakistan relations. It should be settled by the two countries through negotiations having regard to the wishes of the Kashmiri people."

On April 17, he said at Anantnag that he would like to meet the Pakistani leaders and also know their mind.

On April 24, he declared in Srinagar that he would like to have an opportunity to meet Kashmiri leaders like Choudhry Ghulam Abbas, Mir Waiz Yusuf Shah, and others in 'Azad Kashmir'.

On the eve of Sheikh Abdullah's release, I made a statement hoping that it would be possible for the Kashmiri leader to hold discussions with the President of Pakistan. Referring to this suggestion, Sheikh Abdullah stated in Jammu on April 12 that since India and Pakistan were both parties to the Kashmir dispute, what I had said "was reasonable".

It might be recalled that when Pakistan asked for a meeting of the Security Council on Kashmir, we reported that a grave emergency had arisen in Kashmir, with the people having risen in open rebellion against Indian occupation. It was contended then on behalf of India that demonstrations in Kashmir were only the expression of a feeling of grief over the loss of the Holy Relic. But these demonstrations continued menacingly after the restoration of the Holy Relic, and so this contention became untenable. Then the Indian representative was forced to shift his ground.

He would then have us believe that the demonstrations signified only a protest against the local administration. Subsequent events, which have been abundantly reported in the press, some of which I have cited, have exposed the hollowness of this contention also. And so the position is now being taken that the unrest in Kashmir relates to the details, the nuances of Kashmir's accession to India, and not to its very basis.

But again this position has forcefully been challenged throughout the length and breadth of Indian-occupied Kashmir. The fact is now beyond dispute that the people of Kashmir have challenged the validity of the accession to India of their homeland. They have made it plain that they demand their future to be settled by the plebiscite which has been pledged to them by India and Pakistan and the United Nations. "Our demand—plebiscite"—these words have been seen and heard all over Kashmir. There is nothing else that the people of Kashmir demand and there is nothing else that Pakistan wants the Security Council to arrange.

The developments that have taken place have clarified the situation. The people of Kashmir have joined ranks against Indian occupation. But the Government of India, according to its own spokesmen, is not prepared to change its stand that the occupation should continue to be foisted upon the people of Jammu and Kashmir.

Could there be a clearer confrontation directly posing the danger of a head-on clash? I believe that we need to ponder this question carefully. We need to visualize the situation that has arisen now in Indian-occupied Kashmir.

On the one side we see the entire population of the Indian-occupied area making manifest their demand for an early plebiscite to determine their status. On the other side we see the Government of India showing no signs, whatsoever, of relenting from its opposition to this democratic and popular demand of the people of Jammu and Kashmir.

What are the clear affirmations in Sheikh Abdullah's statements which have been acclaimed by the people at large? These affirmations are: (1) that the accession made by the Maharajah in 1947 was provisional and subject to a plebiscite; (2) that any solution of the problem based upon the cease-fire line or its adjustment or rectification is completely unacceptable; (3) that India, Pakistan, and the United Nations are committed, wholly committed, entirely committed, to enabling the people of Kashmir to exercise their right of self-determination; (4) that the elections in the State of Jammu and Kashmir were rigged, spurious and fraudulent; and (5) that the steps taken or contemplated by India to integrate the state into the Indian Union are null and void now and for all time.

Confronted by an outright challenge to its stand, the Indian Government is trying to deal with the people of Kashmir through Sheikh Abdullah by the dual method of cajolery and threat. The threat of re-arresting Sheikh Abdullah, as I have shown, has not been too subtle; nor has any secret been made of the hope that he might be lured into accepting an arrangement falling short of a free and unfettered plebiscite. One can expect that should this manoeuvre succeed, we shall again hear the claim from the representatives of India that the acknowledged leader of the people of Kashmir has accepted India's occupation of Kashmir.

But the issue that we are concerned with is not whether any political manoeuvre by India will succeed or fail. The issue is not what resources India will deploy to sidetrack the demand of the people of Jammu and Kashmir. The issue is the demand itself. The issue is whether the opposition of the people of Kashmir to Indian domination in its demonstrated unanimity is something which can wisely be ignored by the United Nations. It has created a situation now which cannot possibly be left to take care of itself.

Yesterday's press reports tell us of widespread demonstrations by the students in Srinagar in support of the demand of self-determination. The student demonstrators declared that nothing short of a plebiscite would satisfy their demand, and asked the Chief of the United Nations Observers' team to convey their demand to the Security Council. A curfew was imposed on several towns and many people were injured as a result of police baton charges. The ferment in Kashmir continues, replete with grave possibilities of serious trouble. And there is ferment among the people of Pakistan. I must enter the caveat here, and I should not be misunderstood as uttering a threat to India, when I say that if the Indian authorities again resort to a suppression of the people of Kashmir by force, the people of Pakistan may find it extremely difficult to stand aside and may demand of its government whatever measures are necessary for the amelioration of the situation in Indian-occupied Kashmir.

This, I trust, will give the members of the Security Council an idea of the perils facing us if the situation is made subject to a laissez-faire attitude on the Council's part. A situation where an occupation authority is in direct confrontation with the mass of the people united in opposition to it is a situation pregnant with dangers. Should the very sharpness of the situation, with no fluidity and no outlines blurred, evoke a statesmanlike response, a just and honourable solution may yet be achieved. The peril of a direct clash which cannot fail to disrupt the fabric of peace in the sub-continent can still be overcome by the initiative of the Security Council. For, to put it plainly, it is a situation which has to be brought under the control of the United Nations so that it will not jeopardize international peace and security, and peace in the sub-continent.

The urgency of the situation to which I have drawn the Council's attention cannot be appreciated unless we remember that there exists at present not even a truce agreement between India and Pakistan over Kashmir. All that there exists between India and Pakistan over Kashmir is the agreement embodied in the UNCIP resolutions of August 13, 1948, and January 4, 1949. The cease-fire arrangement in Kashmir is based upon these resolutions and in fact constitutes only a partial implementation of them. It has been authoritatively established by the Commission that the cease-fire order was meant to be linked—this was the exact expression used by the Commission—with the truce and with the establishment of the proper conditions for a plebiscite.

The agreement of July 29, 1949, which has been invoked by the representative of India in his letter of March 20, 1964, is merely an agreement for the demarcation of the cease-fire line and explicitly affirms that it is under the provisions of part I of the UNCIP resolution of August 13, 1948.

It is obvious that it is not an independent document or an independent

instrument. If the UNCIP resolutions are regarded as obsolete by India, then the cease-fire order also becomes obsolete. Actually, however, regardless of what the representative of India might say here, a declaration by either party that the agreement embodied in the UNCIP resolution is obsolete does not deserve to be given any consideration unless that party is to be understood as denouncing the cease-fire also and contemplating a resumption of hostilities. I say this because the UNCIP resolutions embody an agreement of which any unilateral denunciation is inadmissible. It is inadmissible because the agreement, first, embodies undertakings of an international character by which the parties have assumed international obligations and, secondly, it constitutes an international engagement for the benefit of third party.

The people of Jammu and Kashmir are third-party beneficiaries of the UNCIP resolutions. The rights of these third-party beneficiaries cannot be extinguished by any unilateral denunciation of the undertaking by India. The objective of the resolutions was, and remains, that of ensuring to the people of the State the free and fair exercise of their basic right to a plebiscite. Such right vests in them as an actual judicial right under the well-established document of stipulation for the rights of others—stipulations *pour autres.*

It follows that these resolutions cannot be abrogated except by the agreement of India, Pakistan, the United Nations and the people of Jammu and Kashmir. I am drawing attention to this basic aspect of the case because it brings out the nature of the situation with which the Security Council is faced. Apart from defining the juridical position involved, it brings into sharp focus the explosive nature of the present situation where the inherent right of the people of Jammu and Kashmir, recognized in a formal instrument, is denied by the Indian Government which proclaims that any assertion of this right constitutes the high crime of treason. Surely, the other party to the agreement which gave recognition to these rights and pledged their fulfilment cannot remain unconcerned or inactive in the face of such an attitude.

I am aware of the impression which exists at present in some quarters that perhaps a loosening of thoughts is in process in India so that we should stand aside and let matters develop by themselves. I have no wish to ignore a salutary, though rather intangible, development. It is true that there are indications that the people of India, by and large, would wish to see the end of the Kashmir dispute which remained frozen for over a decade and constantly strained India's relations with my country. There have been statements from well-known Indian leaders, organizations, and publicists which have stressed the need for the Government of India to do some re-thinking on the Kashmir issue and to realize that their

attitude so far on this question has not done any good to India. Prominent among these are Mr. C. Rajagopalachari, the first Indian Governor-General of independent India and General Cariappa, the first Indian Commander-in-Chief.

Mr. K. Santhanam, in an article in the *Hindustan Times* of April 14, entitled "The Alternatives in Kashmir", considers that the rejection by India of the idea of a plebiscite is wholly inexplicable. Talking of Kashmir and the Sino-Indian disputes, he goes on to suggest:

"The more I think of these problems in which India has got entangled, the more I am convinced that a frank and unconditional acceptance of international conciliation, arbitration and adjudication is the sole logical, wise and humane policy."

According to the article in the *Hindustan Times*, Delhi, of April 15, the position is:

"The real problem in Kashmir is not Sheikh Abdullah. The real problem is that 17 years of (the) independence (of India and Pakistan) have not brought the people of Kashmir political stability, organic unity or security of status.

"It has been assumed too easily that the search for overcoming these disabilities is necessarily inimical to India's interests. Emotive slogans like integration have been allowed to distort the definition of our basic interests to the point where many of us have forgotten that there is such a thing as the people of Kashmir, four and a half million of them, whose wishes need to be taken into account. And whenever one talks about the wishes of the people of Kashmir in respect of ascertaining what they are precisely, we allow opportunist politicians who are only thinking of their own selfish ends, to raise the demon of Pakistani and assorted foreign conspirators at work."

This trend, which is encouraging for peace, has found an apt expression in an article written by Mr. Jaya Prakash Narayan, a prominent Indian leader. Writing in the *Hindustan Times* of April 20, Mr. Jaya Prakash Narayan observes:

"What, after all, is the substance of Sheikh Abdullah's statements? This, that the future of Kashmir has to be decided by the people of Kashmir, and that it has to be done in a manner that the dispute about it between India and Pakistan is amicably ended. With a little imagination it was possible to see that this clear and principled stand of the Kashmiri leader opened for India a wonderful opportunity that could be exploited to the advantage of all concerned. What actually is happening, however, is a parrot-like reiteration of slogans that carry no conviction in any dispassionate quarters.

"One of these slogans is that the accession of Kashmir to India is

final and irrevocable. The Sheikh has questioned that, and it is for impartial lawyers to decide the issue. But the vital point to keep in mind is that it is not by legal advocacy that a human problem like that of Kashmir can ever be settled. Indeed, it was such realisation that had prompted the original promise of the Prime Minister Nehru to ascertain the wishes of the people."

Mr. Narayan goes on to say:

"At this point, two further slogans are raised: first, the people of Kashmir have already expressed their will at three general elections; secondly, if the people of Kashmir are allowed to express their will, it will be the beginning of the end of the Indian nation."

Mr. Narayan continues:

"Both, to my mind, are baseless slogans. The elections in Kashmir after Sheikh Abdullah's arrest were neither fair nor free. If that has to be disproved, it can be done by an impartial inquiry and not just by official assertions. Delhi seems to believe that by auto-suggestion it can establish any fact it pleases."

I am apt to agree with Mr. Narayan that Delhi does seem to believe that by auto-suggestion it can establish any fact it pleases. To go on with Mr. Narayan's statement, he says:

"I may be lacking in patriotism or other virtues, but it has always seemed to me to be a lie to say that the people of Kashmir had already decided to integrate themselves with India. They might do so, but have not done so yet. Apart from the quality of the elections, the future of the State of Jammu and Kashmir was never made an electoral issue at any of them. If further proof were needed, it has come in the form of Sheikh Abdullah's emphatic views, who, to put it at the least, is as representative of the people as any other Kashmiri leader.

"Lastly, if we are so sure of the verdict of the people, why are we so opposed to giving them another opportunity to reiterate it? The answer given is that this would start the process of disintegration of India. Few things have been said in the course of this controversy more silly than this one. The assumption behind the argument is that the states of India are held together by force and not by the sentiment of a common nationality. It is an assumption that makes a mockery of the Indian Nation and a tyrant of the Indian states.

"Threats have been held out that should Sheikh Abdullah misbehave, the law would take its course. The law had taken its course for eleven years and the issue remained unsettled. It is not likely to achieve more in the future. It is remarkable how the freedom-fighters of yesterday begin so easily to imitate the language of the imperialists.

"The last and final slogan raised in the ballyhoo is that there is no Kashmir question at all, and that if there was one at any time, it has now been settled once and for all. Kashmir is a part of India and that is a fact of history, they say. That, I think, is the worst form of auto-suggestion.

"The slogan-raisers forget that less than half of the State of Jammu and Kashmir is under the occupation of Pakistan. Has that been accepted as a settled fact? If so, when and where? If not, how is the issue of Kashmir settled, except in the private thoughts of those who believe that we shall keep what we have and they shall keep what they have. Secondly, the issue is still pending before the Security Council and United Nations observers are still posted in Kashmir. Thirdly, here is a leader of the stature of Sheikh Abdullah, who clearly states that the issue has yet to be settled . . . therefore, as an humble servant of this country, I plead earnestly that instead of trying to take shelter in a fool's paradise of our own making, let us have the courage to face facts and deal with them on the basis of the ideals and fundamental principles that guided our freedom movement."

Mr. Jaya Prakash Narayan is no mean leader of India. He was a founder and architect of the Indian independence movement. Mr. Narayan is by no means a voice in the wilderness. Fortunately, there are also other voices of reason in India which make themselves heard from time to time. The Chairman of the Praja Socialist Party, Mr. S. M. Joshi, stated on April 20 that the wishes of the people of Kashmir should be ascertained to solve the Kashmir problem, that India should honour her promises in this regard because it was agreed at the time of the cease-fire that the wishes of the people of the State would be ascertained. Mr. Joshi added, and I quote from the *Times of India* of April 21:

"It is said that we have not fulfilled the undertaking. Our position has been falsified in international politics."

These developments are no doubt encouraging to all those who want to establish a climate of friendship between India and Pakistan. It is, however, important to appreciate that it is not something which can be left to grow by itself. A concrete improvement in the present state of affairs cannot thus be achieved. On the contrary, it is a trend which will develop only if it is nourished by the influence and activity of the United Nations and by the goodwill and earnestness that we believe is reflected here in the Security Council.

Perhaps this consideration needs to be put in plainer words. A voice like that of Mr. Narayan, whom I have quoted at length, in India is the voice of reason and of conscience. It is the voice that beckons India to the paths of peace. But if the Security Council which in this matter represents the

reason and conscience of the world remains silent, this voice becomes a voice in the wilderness. It becomes lost in the din of the overweening and obdurate policies of the Indian Government. One has only to consider the history of the Kashmir dispute to realize this truth. The elements in India which seek a just and honourable settlement of the Kashmir dispute have existed all along but they have received scant encouragement from elsewhere. Impartial public opinion throughout the world has condemned the Kashmir policy of the Indian Government both from the ethical and the political points of view but no effort has been made so far, no initiative taken at the international level which would bring about the required revision of the policy of the Government of India, a revision which is desired by the world at large.

During the recent weeks the struggle of the people of Kashmir has gathered momentum within the state. In ever-increasing numbers nations throughout the world are showing visible manifestation of their support to the people of Kashmir in their quest for self-determination. At the last session I informed the Council of the support of the 700 million people of China who are the immediate neighbours of the Kashmiri people, to a Kashmir solution based on the wishes of the people of Kashmir as pledged to them by India and Pakistan. Since then the President of Iraq has extended his support to the implementation of the United Nations resolutions on Kashmir. Earlier, in December, the Government of Ceylon publicly called for an early solution of the dispute in accordance with the wishes of the people of the state as envisaged in the resolutions of the Security Council which were accepted by both Pakistan and India.

More recently, on April 15 and April 18, the Governments of Indonesia and the Philippines called for a settlement of the Kashmir dispute in accordance with the wishes of the people of Jammu and Kashmir. The hundred million people of Indonesia, through a joint communique signed by the Foreign Ministers of Indonesia and Pakistan on April 15, recalled with regret:

> "that the dispute between India and Pakistan over Kashmir has not been solved peacefully and might even constitute a threat to peace and stability in the region. They agreed that this dispute involved the question of fundamental rights of the people of Kashmir and impaired the growth of friendly relations between Pakistan and India affecting also the development of Asian-African solidarity. The two Foreign Ministers, therefore, called for an early solution of this dispute in accordance with the wishes of the people of the State and other provisions as envisaged in the Security Council resolutions which were accepted by both India and Pakistan."

The relevant portion of the joint communique signed by the Foreign

Ministers of the Philippines and Pakistan stated:

"The Foreign Secretary of the Philippines and the Foreign Minister of Pakistan agreed that the Kashmir dispute between Pakistan and India involved the question of the fundamental rights of the people of Kashmir and that this dispute inhibits the establishment of friendly relations between Pakistan and India to the disadvantage of the development of solidarity between African and Asian countries. The two Ministers agreed on the need for an early solution of the dispute in accordance with the wishes of the people of Kashmir as envisaged in the resolutions of the Security Council of the United Nations which have been accepted by both Pakistan and India."

Among the other nations of the two continents which in recent weeks have similarly emphasized to delegations composed of Kashmiri leaders which visited them the necessity for an early settlement of the Kashmir dispute in accordance with the principle of self-determination, as pledged to the people of Kashmir by India, Pakistan, and the United Nations are: Morocco, the Ivory Coast, Nigeria, Sierra Leone, Guinea, Senegal, Sudan, Somalia, Algeria, and Tunisia in the continent of Africa, and Ceylon, Iraq, Turkey, Syria, Jordan, Lebanon, and Saudi Arabia in the continent of Asia.

I find it necessary in this context to quote from a recent statement issued by President Habib Bourguiba on March 19 after his meeting with the Kashmiri leader of a delegation which visited some of the countries of Africa and Asia last month:

"I remember the position I had taken some years ago on this very subject. My stand was not that of a Muslim supporting Muslims but that of a man who respects human dignity and the right of a people to decide for themselves—a principle that constitutes one of the most noble manifestations of respect for humanity. I remember also having publicly taken a clear stand against India's refusal to heed the Security Council resolution to hold a plebiscite in Kashmir.

"My stand does not mean that I support one party against another, Muslims against Hindus, or Pakistan against India. We have made it clear that on this question our position is inspired by decisions taken in the Security Council.

"We have clearly explained in our correspondence to the Indian Prime Minister that we cannot approve of India's policy on this particular issue and that we remain firm on our stand that we have taken."

In the same vein, President Ben Bella has stated:

"We have always been cognizant of the Kashmir case and have made our position clear, namely, that the people of Kashmir should have the right of self-determination and that the resolutions of the Security

Council in this regard be fully implemented."

Needless to say, the people of Pakistan and the people of Kashmir shall remain ever grateful for these important and heroic statements of Africans who have pronounced so nobly and so boldly and in such an impartial way on a just and a righteous cause. Assurances of support by all these countries and by others also have been extended to the cause of the people of Kashmir, who have thus behind them, in their bitter struggle against Indian chauvinism and neo-colonialism, the sympathy and support of all anti-colonial peoples of Asia and Africa, and indeed also of Latin America.

And yet the Prime Minister of India persuaded himself to declare in the Indian Parliament on April 13 that the Kashmir problem would have been solved long ago had it not been for Western support for Pakistan. Such myopia is truly tragic. May I remind the Prime Minister that the Kashmir problem would have been solved long ago had it not been for the infidelity of his government to the principles of international justice, and its repudiation of its own solemn pledges and international commitments. If the Kashmir problem has remained alive in spite of all the repression, the terror, and domination to which the Kashmiri people have been subjected for seventeen years, it is because the spirit of the Kashmiri people is indestructible and their resolve to secure their rights remains unshaken.

Members of the Security Council have supported the principle of self-determination as set forth in the two UNCIP resolutions. India and Pakistan are also parties to those resolutions. Having committed itself to the implementation of these resolutions of its own free will, India has sought to repudiate that obligation and even to deny the existence of the Kashmir dispute. And now the Prime Minister of India, with an air of injured innocence, bewails in effect that the Security Council, and particularly its Western members, have failed to execute a similar volte-face.

Let me also remind the Prime Minister of India that it is not only the West which has refused to betray the people of Kashmir. Since 1948, when the Security Council first became seized of the Kashmir dispute, some thirty countries of Latin America, Africa, Asia, Europe, and North America which have at one time or another been non-permanent members of the Security Council have also called for the implementation of the UNCIP resolutions.

Let not the Prime Minister of India nurse the illusion that the Kashmir dispute would have been solved according to his own wishes long ago, but for Western support to Pakistan. Let him remember that not only the West, but the countries of Asia, Africa and Latin America as well have clearly espoused the cause of the people of Kashmir and called for the implementation of the United Nations Commission's resolutions to resolve this dispute in a peaceful and just manner.

I have dealt so far in my statement with the new elements in the Kashmir dispute, the people's revolt against Indian domination, and the rapidly increasing international sympathy and support from Western Europe, from Latin America, and particularly from the peoples and the governments of Asia and Africa, for their struggle to achieve a peaceful and just settlement of the dispute through the exercise of their right to self-determination as pledged to them by India and Pakistan and by the United Nations.

I have set forth the declarations of Sheikh Abdullah and Mirza Afzal Beg on the questions of self-determination, accession, plebiscite, and integration, and on the procedures that should be adopted to bring about an amicable settlement of the dispute between India and Pakistan in accordance with the wishes of the Kashmiri people. I have also set forth the views of the men of peace and goodwill in India in regard to these basic issues.

But what is the response of the Government of India to the imperatives of the situation? Has there been any attempt on its part to reassess it and to revise its policies with a view to finding an amicable settlement of this dispute? Regrettably, this does not seem to be the case.

Speaking in the Indian Parliament on April 13, the Prime Minister of India dismissed Sheikh Abdullah's statements by merely describing them as "unfortunate". Mr. Lal Bahadur Shastri, Minister without Portfolio, thought it fit to reiterate in the Indian Parliament on April 12 that "the accession of Kashmir to India is irrevocable". Mr. Shastri even threatened the Kashmiri leader with serious consequences for expressing a contrary view. The Indian Home Minister, Mr. Nanda, pompously declared "certain facts of history cannot be undone. The accession of Jammu and Kashmir to the Indian Union was a fact of Indian history. It is a fact of world history. There can be no going back on that". Mr. M. C. Chagla, the Indian Minister for Education now sitting before us, laid down the limits of Sheikh Abdullah's freedom of speech and expression. He declared on April 10 that any discussion of the Kashmir issue between the Indian leaders and Sheikh Abdullah must be "within the context of Kashmir being an integral part of India". The Minister for Education also warned Sheikh Abdullah that if he did not change his mind on Kashmir's status, the "law should take its course". This is a threat by a former judge.

The new puppet "Prime Minister" of Indian-occupied Kashmir, Mr. G. M. Sadiq, not to be outdone in the campaign of intimidation against the Sheikh, boasted on April 16: "No magician has yet been born who will just breathe, and our administration and forces will vanish". He echoed that Kashmir was as much a part of India as Bombay, Calcutta, or Madras.

On the question of India's plans for integration of the state, Mr. Sadiq declared on April 19 that there was no question of the infamous bill for changing the nomenclature of the "Sadar-i-Riyasat" and "Prime Minister"

of Jammu and Kashmir to "Governor" and "Chief Minister" being delayed. He promised that it would be taken up definitely in the next session of the state assembly. On April 20, this puppet "premier" again advocated, in the capital of India, the early abrogation of Article 370 of the Indian constitution to make Kashmir's integration with India complete.

On April 15, Mr. G. L. Nanda, the Home Minister of the Indian Government, said in the Indian Parliament that the accession of Jammu and Kashmir to the Indian Union was "complete, final and irrevocable", and that the policy of the government "is not going to be changed because somebody has said something somewhere".

On April 29, Mr. Krishnamachari, the Finance Minister, made a very revealing and rather picturesque statement in the Indian Parliament. He said that there was "no question of second thoughts" by the government on the status of Kashmir and that "the fundamentals of Kashmir's accession to India have already been settled, and only nuances remain to be discussed".

It seems—though it is hard to believe—that this Indian minister is seeking to be reminded that the India-Pakistan question does not relate to what he has called the "nuances" of Kashmir's accession to India. The Security Council is not exercised over the "nuances" of accession. Pakistan's case is not directed to these "nuances". The international agreement between India and Pakistan concerning the disposition of Kashmir is not meant to settle these "nuances". It has been made clear by the people of Kashmir, in every way possible, that they are not agitated over how these "nuances" are to be determined. They, the people of Kashmir, Pakistan, and the United Nations, all are concerned with the fundamental question of Kashmir's accession to India or to Pakistan, in accordance with the will of the people to be impartially ascertained. If any negotiations are to take place between India and Pakistan, the negotiations will deal with this fundamental question and this fundamental question alone, and not with any "nuances".

This is how the Indian Government and its henchmen have reacted to the demand of the people of Jammu and Kashmir for self-determination and to the support that this demand has received throughout the world.

At this particular juncture the interests of the people of Kashmir, the interests of the people of the sub-continent, indeed of all Asia, demand that the Security Council take whatever steps may be necessary to move this dispute rapidly towards a peaceful and honourable settlement.

India claims that the people of Kashmir have already expressed their wishes on the question of accession. We maintain that the people of Kashmir have not so far been allowed to exercise their right of self-determination. We assert that they have yet to take a decision on the question of accession to India or to Pakistan. We, therefore, suggest that Sheikh Abdullah may

be invited to appear before the Security Council as he should be able to give the Security Council information which will be of assistance in examining the question. I request that steps may be taken immediately to this end and that under rule 39 of the provisional rules of procedure this should be done. The precedent has been established by the Council of inviting persons under this rule without concerning itself with legal and constitutional questions. This, I believe, should assure a sympathetic consideration of my suggestion.

If I might use this occasion to transmit a message from the people of Pakistan to the people of India, it is this: For sixteen years, we have been in a quagmire of controversies and conflict. Perhaps such dismal phases are bound to occur in the long history of nations everywhere. But an end to them is also bound to come. The truth has been uttered by wise men on countless occasions that there is a time for acrimony and there is a time for reconciliation. There is a time to wound and there is a time to heal. There is a time for assertion and a time for acceptance. For sixteen years, India has stalled and prevaricated; for sixteen years, Kashmir has been denied its inherent right to share in the freedom that came to India and Pakistan. The time to continue this state of affairs is now past. The time is over for India to be swayed by pique and to be dominated by narrow considerations of prestige. The time is over for violating the spirit of the age, which is that of freedom and self-determination. Now the time has arrived for atonement. The moment has come for removing the shackles which have bound the people of Kashmir. The moment has come when, with statesmanship and vision, a wrong will be redressed, a burden eased, a pledge fulfilled, and a word of honour kept. The time is now for placing the relationship of India and Pakistan on a footing of justice and tolerance and peace.

It might be that, through the mysterious workings of Providence and the will of Allah, a stage has been reached in the affairs of India and Pakistan which offers an unparallelled opportunity to both countries to open a new era of good neighbourliness and constructive endeavours. Kashmir is the crux of our relationship. If we settle this issue with due regard to the principles which we have both solemnly accepted and on which we have based our pledge to the people of Kashmir, we will move together to the uplands of sanity and peace. On the other hand, if we remain entangled in the cogs of bitterness, we will consign ourselves to the abyss of conflict and hate. A tide has come in our affairs which, caught at the flood, will lead us both to fortune. Omitted, it will bind our voyage to shallows and miseries. The moment has arrived which will decide whether India and Pakistan will justly settle their dispute and fulfil their destinies or whether they will remain estranged from each other and thus lose their ventures in a challenging and expanding world.

Address to the One Thousand One Hundred and Fourteenth Meeting of the Security Council on May 11, 1964

Mr. President,

There was a good deal of invective and vituperation in the statement of the representative of India. As my countrymen have read the statement, it is natural that many of them would want me to reply in kind. An eye for an eye and a tooth for a tooth is a primal human impulse and the resultant temptation is not always easy to resist. But my position is different from that of the representative of India. His concern is to avoid a solution of the problem before us; my duty is to urge that a just solution be effected speedily. Considering the human poignancy of the problem, considering the travail and suffering of the people of Kashmir, I cannot allow myself to be deflected from the path of seeking an end to the tragedy which has overtaken that unhappy land since 1947. The Indian representative enjoys abundant freedom to vilify us and to try to confuse the Security Council. My freedom, on the other hand, is greatly circumscribed by the duty to clear away the undergrowth, if I can, and again and again to emphasize to the Security Council, at the risk, perhaps, of wearying members, that the problem will not take care of itself unless the Council takes it effectively in hand. That is my primary aim, but while I have to keep it steadily in view, I am also confronted with the necessity of setting the record straight. It is not an agreeable task. But it is mandatory. For, where the life and future of millions are involved, where the honour and reputation of a country are concerned, it is not something from which one can, in conscience, abstain.

Beneath a rather transparent mask of righteous indignation, there was a note of desperation in the speech of the Education Minister of India. The desperation is understandable. It is caused by the fact that the overwhelming force of public opinion in Kashmir has removed every moral and political

prop from under India's occupation of the State. Perhaps the Indian representative feels bound to voice this desperation. But the extraordinary thing about his statement was not so much its poverty of facts and arguments as a plethora of irrelevancies.

Members of the Security Council have doubtless noted that, in his statement, the Indian representative dwelt on the situation between India and China, on SEATO and CENTO, on the happenings in Djakarta, on the Christian minority in Bengal, on the culture and cosmology of Pakistan, on the menace of military alliances, on Bourbons and brothels, and on a variety of other topics. Indeed, he opened his speech by talking of the Chinese conflict with India, which has nothing to do with the present situation in Indian-occupied Kashmir. Assuming that it is not against Indian policy to maintain a sense of proportion and rational discourse, this injection of irrelevancies is not an accident. It is deliberate. Its design is obvious. It is nothing other than to make a debate on Kashmir in the Security Council so utterly confused as to choke off every constructive proposal.

In my earlier statement, I had deliberately refrained from referring to the communal situation in the region because the Home Ministers of India and Pakistan have met to find a solution of the problem of evictions of Indian Muslim nationals and to bring about the restoration of a sense of security and safety to the minorities in both the countries. I do not in any way wish to prejudice those efforts or to inflame communal passions.

The Education Minister of India, on the other hand, has recklessly tried to rake up the embers of religious passions by charges of murder, loot and worse alleged to have been carried out against the Hindus, Christians, and Buddhists in Pakistan. The world is aware that there has been a mass killing of Muslim men, women, and children in certain parts of India, especially Eastern India, and the vandalistic destruction of their properties, homes, and honour.

The single-mindedness with which the representative of India set about maligning my country led him to make the charge that Pakistan was founded on the principle of religious apartheid. This attempt to establish guilt by association is not only a calumny against my country but an insult to the struggle of the people of South Africa for equality, justice, and freedom.

The Education Minister of India ought to know that the ideology of Pakistan is truly founded on Islam which admits of no apartheid, racial or religious. In history Islam has been a liberating force, upholding the equality and dignity of man as an individual human person regardless of race, creed, or colour. This revolutionary role of Islam is universally acknowledged and I can only deplore that Mr. Chagla should consider the ideology of Islam to be mediaeval and reactionary. Islam acknowledges no established church nor does it recognize priesthood. We, the people of Pakistan, for that matter

those of Asia and Africa, who are the followers of Islam, recognize that all modern concepts of human equality in political, social, and economic spheres are implicit in its teachings.

The predominantly Muslim countries which are Members of the United Nations recognize Islam in their constitutions as the official religion of the State. Does that make them mediaeval and reactionary? Does the Education Minister of India consider them, by virtue of such a provision in their constitutions, as practitioners of religious apartheid?

I would have thought that a representative of India would take particular care to avoid using such expressions as religious apartheid, a unique form of intolerance, the only example of which is provided by the Indian caste system. Indian society for more than 2,000 years, notwithstanding the constitution of India, lives, moves, and has its being in the caste system which is the negation of equality of man, the dignity and worth of the human person.

If, therefore, "religious apartheid" was involved in the creation of Pakistan, then the Muslims of the sub-continent were its victims and not its perpetrators.

The trouble with many Indian leaders is that they insist that Pakistan and its people should renounce the spiritual values of their faith which nurture the institutions and guide their way of life, before India can accept Pakistan's existence as an independent and sovereign state and as a fact of life. Such attempts at ideological aggression are contrary to the principles of peaceful co-existence between different political, social, and economic systems in which alone rests the hope for world peace and the survival of human dignity.

In saying this, I have perhaps paid some tribute to the endeavours in India to make the Indian society a secular society, because if a Muslim from India is unable to appreciate the values, the principles, and the guiding forces of Islam, he has surely become a secular citizen.

There is another matter on which I must set the record straight, as the Education Minister of India has misquoted me. What I said in my intervention in Parliament, to which he referred, is that in relations between states and on the question of settlement of international disputes, the internal political and social regimes of countries are not relevant. Amplifying this statement I said on that occasion, and on several others, that whether India has parliamentary democracy and Pakistan has the Presidential system, whether India has direct elections and Pakistan has indirect ones, whether India has the caste system and Pakistan has not, are questions irrelevant to the question of a Kashmir settlement. What I said then and what I say now, is elementary international law, and it is also a principle of Panchshila. I am surprised that the Education Minister of India should have forgotten so readily the principles of Panchshila proclaimed so resoundingly by his

country for so many years and which the world was never permitted to forget. And yet the Minister of India talks of the Bourbons.

Mr. Chagla has taken special pains to malign Pakistan in the eyes of the Christian world. May I inform the Council of the sentiments of the Pakistani Christians whose leaders in a joint statement on March 14 said:

"We never sensed any feeling of communal hatred or misgivings from the members of the majority community towards us in Pakistan".

A prominent leader of the Garo tribe in East Pakistan, Kan Sangura, in a statement published in the press on April 7, 1964, stated:

"We had never received any ill-treatment from anybody in Pakistan. We left our villages only out of fear as one day we suddenly saw a group of people belonging to the Bangshi and Hajang tribes leave Pakistan for India. We stayed there about a month, after which the Indian Officers started taking away the Christian Garos to far-off places. We were frightened at this and wanted to return to Pakistan. This infuriated the Indian officials who refused to let us go back to Pakistan".

Referring to the Garo exodus from Pakistan, the President of Pakistan, addressing a mammoth meeting on March 4, in East Pakistan, declared that Pakistan wants all the migrants to return to their homes and that the government would in this connection make earnest efforts to assist them, that their homes and their lands would be protected by the Government of Pakistan until they returned to Pakistan. In response to the President's declaration, these tribes are now gradually returning to Pakistan. So far, more than twelve hundred families of Garo Christians have returned to their homes.

As to the treatment meted out to Christian minority in Pakistan, let me quote from a statement made today by Mr. Joshua Fazluddin, a Christian leader who is a recipient of the Pope's Medal and Rosary and a versifier of Holy Gospels. I quote:

"The Garos got direct inspiration, even aid, to leave Pakistan.

"The exodus of Garos, even their number, is not at all a true index of the treatment of the Christian minority in Pakistan".

"In Pakistan the Christians enjoy perfect social freedom and security as evidenced by the growing number of Christian schools, colleges, hospitals and other institutions. That they enjoy perfect religious freedom is clear enough from the growing number of churches and convents as well as theological schools and colleges, and that there is no prejudice against Christian workers is amply proven by the advent of many new missionaries."

The representative of India painted a glowing picture of the condition of the minorities in secular India. Let me now place before the Council the views of a Christian Member of the Indian Parliament on the communal situation in India. Mr. Frank Anthony, let me say, is no publicist of Pakistan.

He was heckled by frenzied interruptions and prevented from completing his speech in the Parliament of a country which, Mr. Chagla would have the Council believe, is the epitome of secular democracy . Mr. Anthony said on April 14, 1964, according to the official records of the Indian Parliament:

> "How will you ever attract their"—Indian Muslims—"loyalty and love for this country if every now and then they are made the objects of recurring murder, if every now and then they have to walk in the shadow of death, of arson, of loot and of rape?"

According to Mr. Anthony, the ruling party in India is infected with communalism:

> "Look at some of the states, some of the leading members of the ruling party, indistinguishable in their thinking, in their approach from the worst communal elements in India."

About the militant Hindu organizations in India, Mr. Anthony has this to say:

> "There are well-known communal parties in this country. There is no need to name them; they are already known. In spite of their protestations, their goals and their objectives are clear. The tragedy is that they not only have the political, but they have para-military aims."

This statement deserves to be carefully noted. It means that the Government of India permits militant communal organizations, whose avowed object is the expulsion or annihilation and termination of the minorities to maintain para-military forces to consummate their ends.

An English language newspaper of Calcutta, the *Statesman* of May 4, has this report from a special correspondent who had toured the riot-torn areas in Eastern India, in regard to the complicity of the administration in the riots:

> "They"—the Hindus—"had also learnt that one could get away with looting, arson, murder and other crimes if these are committed in an organized way."

Mr. Jai Parkash Narayan—whom the representative of India referred to as the infinitesimal voice in India representing a small body of public opinion, which I think we all know is not truly correct because Mr. Jai Parkash Narayan was one of the founding fathers of the Indian liberation movement and is still a very important force in the political life of India—wrote a letter to the presiding officers of both Houses of the Indian Parliament after visiting the riot affected areas. The text was published in the Indian press on April 17:

> "I visited all the affected areas in the city (Jamshedpur) but did not have the stomach to visit more than two of the seventeen Muslim refugee camps."

He goes on to describe the extent of the disturbances of which the Govern-

ment of India was apparently oblivious:

"Terrible things have happened and on a scale that has not been realized by Delhi or the country at large."

The organized nature of these crimes has been emphasized in this letter also:

"There is no doubt in my mind that there was an organization behind these dastardly activities which operated from a common centre, manufactured and spread rumours, planned and financed specific actions, provided the whole operation with a political and philosophical justification."

This is about the happenings in India—secular India, democratic India, modern India.

How and why the Indian administration failed to deal with this organized, militant force is also described in Mr. Narayan's letter:

"It was further proved how indequate and inefficient was the civil administration and how the forces of law and order were themselves infected considerably with the virus of communalism."

This virus of communalism, according to the letter, has also affected the political parties in India:

"It is interesting to note that all the political parties"—chiefly three operate in the area: the Congress, PSP, and CPI— "and the trade unions were rendered completely impotent in the face of the upsurge of organized criminality."

And finally, Mr. Narayan's letter states:

"It was also proved that education"—this will be interesting to the Minister for Education—"including science and engineering education, was no guarantee against animality and criminality."—which was epitomized the other day.

In a joint statement issued in Calcutta, on Saturday, April 25, 1964, Mr. J. P. Narayan and seven other Indian leaders stated the truth about the communal riots in India. I shall quote some extracts of the statement:

"Atrocitites have been committed in India that are as bestial, shameful and unthinkable as any committed elsewhere."

It goes on:

"Women, and pregnant women at that, had been cut down, bludgeoned to death, babies thrown into the fire and young women raped to death."

In contrast, the Muslims in Pakistan risked their lives to save Hindu citizens, and this is also acknowledged in the Indian leaders' statement:

"There"—in Pakistan—"at least thirty young Muslims have laid down their lives in trying to protect their Hindu neighbours."

It is a noteworthy fact of Indian political life that organized political parties exist in India with their own para-military organization, or private armies, which are allowed to develop and flourish and which are dedicated

to the mass expulsion of the 50-million-strong Muslim minority, or its annihilation as a separate religious and cultural group by force and by violence. I make this statement with all deliberation and due sense of responsibility, and I am prepared to substantiate it, if called upon, in this world forum. By way of instance, let me quote to you what Mr. Frank Anthony, an Indian Christian, member of the Indian Parliament, said in the Indian Parliament as reported in the London *Times* of April 14:

> "The heart of his speech"—as reported by the *Times*' correspondent—"however was a charge that communal killings this year had not been spontaneous outbreaks of Hindus maddened by reports of the sufferings of fellow Hindus in East Pakistan, but an organized expression of entrenched 'revivalist' political forces in this country (India). He asserted that men in the pay of these revivalists"—which can be taken to mean parties such as the Jan Sangh and the Hindu Mahasabha—"had been responsible for the killing of Muslims and had incited the tribal peoples into attacking not only Muslims but, he"—Mr. Anthony— "implied 'defenceless men, women and children' of his own Anglo-Indian community."
>
> "For all the official talk of the need for 'exemplary punishment' few, if any, murder charges have arisen from this year's killings."

And yet the representative of India talks of his country as a modern and secular state, believing in a multi-communal, multi-linguistic society and accuses my country of keeping up religious frenzy and religious fanaticism.

Recently, Mr. N. M. Anwar, Congress Member from Madras, caused a stir in the Rajya Sabha when he bluntly admitted that the Muslims in the ruling Congress Party are "show boys". Participating in the debate on the Finance Bill, Mr. Anwar dwelt on the problems of the Muslim minority in India and said that the problems of India's 50 million Muslims were innumerable.

Speaking of the Indian Union Muslim League Mr. Anwar said that this organization "often interpreted the mind and soul of the Muslim community of this country". He welcomed the release of Sheikh Abdullah and expressed the hope that Sheikh Abdullah, who is the real architect of Kashmir's destiny, would bring about closer relations between India and Pakistan.

Mr. Anwar—a Member of the Indian Parliament, like the Indian representative here—said:

> "Certainly, where is the comparison? I tell you that Sheikh Abdullah is bringing home the lesson to the Hindu community of India that, if you want to look for real leadership of the Muslims, do not go to show boys and charity boys. They are going to be not assets but liabilities to the Hindu society......"
>
> "Under the present joint electorate system the Hindu society has no opportunity to get to know the real mind of the Muslim community

because most of the Muslims whom the secular party has adopted have naturally got to be considered as show boys of the majority community."

In my statement of February 7, I had apprised the members of the Security Council of the brutal evictions of the Muslims of India from the States of Assam and Tripura in Eastern India. The representative of the Government of India has claimed:

"Hardly any Muslim of the 50 million Muslims in India wishes to leave the country."

I challenge that statement of the Education Minister. After the communal killings in January last, over 100,000 Muslim refugees poured into East Pakistan from the neighbouring districts of West Bengal, a province of India. In Calcutta alone, nearly 2,000 families demanded migration certificates from the Deputy High Commissioner for Pakistan to seek asylum in East Pakistan.

In addition, 130,000 Muslims have so far entered East Pakistan, driven out of India, deprived of their belongings under an organized plan of the Indian authorities. It should be realized by the Government of India that the root of the problem in the present circumstances is its policy of eviction of Muslims. One hundred and thirty thousand displaced and destitute people have poured into East Pakistan over the last two years. The continuance of these evictions results in the creation of insecurity and uncertainty in the minds of the Hindu minority in Pakistan. The allurements that Indian authorities provide for the migration of Hindus from Pakistan add to the difficulties of the situation.

Members of the Security Council are aware that there is a substantial number of Buddhists living in Pakistan—some half-million of them. The Education Minister of India has said that we are treating our Buddhists "abominably". Let us see what the Buddhist leaders in Pakistan have to say. The leader of the Buddhist delegation to the Asian Buddhist Conference has made this statement:

"I take this opportunity to mention, by way of showing an example of mutual respect for different religions in Pakistan, as in other civilized countries, that our government have donated us a spacious plot of land in Dacca"—that is in East Pakistan—"for setting up an international Buddhist university and other related institutions. Besides, the Pakistan Government is extending to us all facilities in the field of education, culture and development of general social life."

While the Education Minister has talked of the so-called ill-treatment of Christians in Pakistan, he has been silent about the systematic and brutal persecution of the Nagas, most of them Christians, which has been going on in East India for many years. Let me refer to the latest independent report about the Nagas, which appeared in the *Observer* of London in a dispatch

from a special correspondent published in its issue of February 23, 1963:

"Reports from Nagaland reveal serious military repression both before and after the elections for the new Naga State Assembly on January 31."

The correspondent gives an eye-witness account, which I quote:

"On December 4, three villages were burnt and the populations were badly beaten. Women and children were not spared. A one-year-old child was snatched from its mother and its hands broken in two."

This is not a statement by the Pakistan Government, but from the London Observer. It goes on:

"Five people were beaten to death. Four others were shot. They were chosen because they were influential men in their society."

Brutalities of this kind have been perpetrated on the Nagas for a long time. Sixteen years of aggression and terror have been visited upon this small Christian fortress in the Eastern part of India. In spite of India's ruthless drive to crush the spirit of the Nagas, these brave people have fought and resisted all Indian inroads against their liberation movement.

"We have been witnessing with amusement, and also with a certain amount of disgust, the greatest tightrope act ever seen in international affairs. Pakistan has achieved this act with extraordinary skill by keeping one foot in SEATO and CENTO and the other in the Chinese camp."

Apparently, India's amusement and disgust are reserved for Pakistan alone and not for the other members of Western alliances, who recognize China and desire to promote normal relations with that country in the interests of world peace.

May I ask the representative of India what his own country is doing. It has one foot in the Communist camp and the other in the Western camp. It is dancing to both tunes. While it proclaims non-alignment with both, it exploits both, and each against the interests of the other. India accepts arms aid from both the Communist and non-communist camps. India's arms are very long: it takes both from the West and from the East. Today, reports in *The New York Times* show that it is asking for massive military assistance from the United States. Can India, then, still claim to be a non-aligned country? And yet it has persistently denounced Pakistan for being a member of SEATO and CENTO, both of which are defensive alliances.

Whatever the changing world situation, India claims the change in its favour. Whatever the change, India interprets it as another reason to reinforce its hold on Kashmir. When Pakistan accepted United States military, assistance, the situation in Kashmir underwent a change, according to India, in favour of India, so as to justify refusal to implement the right of self-determination of the people of Jammu and Kashmir. When Pakistan joined SEATO and CENTO, the situation in Kashmir changed, according to India, in favour of India, to reinforce its stand against the self-determination

of the people of Jammu and Kashmir. When the world was divided into two cohesive camps, the situation in Kashmir, according to India, underwent a change in favour of India, to force the people of Jammu and Kashmir to remain bound to India against their wishes. Now, when India accepts military aid and has become aligned *de facto*, the situation, according to India, has changed in favour of India, foreclosing the right of the people of Jammu and Kashmir to determine their future freely and in accordance with their wishes. And today, when the patterns of alignment and non-alignment have altered radically, the situation, according to India, has changed in favour of India, permitting it to absorb and devour Kashmir as an integral part of India. Thus, whatever the change, one fact stands out changeless, and that is that the situation can never change except to the detriment of the people of Jammu and Kashmir.

To India, there is no such thing as the objective merits of claims. The Greeks of old had their sophists and the Middle Ages their schoolmen. The modern world has the practitioners of statecraft from modern, democratic secular India.

What the Preparatory Meeting of the sponsors of the Second Asian-African Conference, which was held recently in Djakarta, has to do with the present debate in the Security Council would, perhaps, bewilder all of us. It is, however, obvious to my delegation why the representative of India, who has been a jurist and has invoked the rules of evidence, which he loves so much, should yet disregard those very rules by citing patent irrelevancies to the Security Council. He said:

> "....Pakistan, China and a few other countries"—why does he not admit it, why does he not say Indonesia, why does he not have the courage to say "Pakistan, China and Indonesia?"—"ganged up to deny to the USSR a place in the Asian world and refused Malaysia admittance to the Asian-African Conference as an Asian country, to which they have an undoubted right."

These statements are untrue; they are utterly untrue. They have been made in a blatant attempt to win favour for India in certain quarters by maligning and misrepresenting Pakistan.

I must state for the record and state most clearly what happened in the Djakarta meeting. It is well known that the Government of India made every endeavour to prevent the convening of a Second Asian-African Conference. When these attempts failed, the representatives of India descended on Djakarta. Two days before the end of the Preparatory Meeting, without any consultation or notice, India proposed that the Soviet Union should be invited to the Second Asian-African Conference. All delegations were taken, somewhat by surprise as the USSR had not participated in the first Bandung Conference. While acknowledging the great contribution made by the Soviet

Union to the struggles of African and Asian peoples against imperialism and colonialism, several countries expressed doubts as to whether the Soviet Union is an Asian Power. Other delegations wanted time to seek instructions from their governments. I made it very clear on behalf of Pakistan that we were taking no position on the substance of the proposal, but that we needed time to consult Karachi and Rawalpindi. Therefore, it ill becomes the representative of India to say that Pakistan "ganged up" with a few other countries—he means Indonesia and Indonesia alone—"to deny to the USSR a place in the Asian world".

In regard to Malaysia, I expressly stated that Pakistan considered that Malaysia should be invited to the Second Asian-African Conference as soon as possible. I made this statement on April 14, in the presence of the Indian delegation and other delegations which were present at that meeting.

The representative of India has again accused Pakistan of handing over 2,000 square miles of territory "at other people's expense" to the People's Republic of China. Pakistan has not surrendered as single inch of territory to the People's Republic of China. The boundary negotiations, which took place in a spirit of mutual accommodation and compromise, resulted in the relinquishment of 750 square miles of territory by China in favour of Pakistan—territory which lies beyond the main axis of the Karakorum mountains which constitutes the principal water-shed between the Indus and the Tarim River basins. These 750 square miles of territory was in the effective possession of China prior to the boundary agreement and had always been under Chinese jurisdiction and control. From the end of the nineteenth century, when the British rulers of India acquired control of the Northern areas of the State of Jammu and Kashmir, never did they once exercise control or jurisdiction over the 2,000 square miles that Pakistan is accused of having surrendered to China or even over the 750 square miles of territory relinquished by the People's Republic of China to Pakistan. On the contrary, notes sent by the former British Government of India to the Chinese authorities acknowledge the latter's title and sovereignty over this area, and these notes exist in the archives of the British and Pakistan Governments.

The representative of India ought to know that where frontiers are undefined, and territories have for centuries remained in the possession of the other side, it is fantastic to talk of "surrender" of the territory which has never been in one's possession and to which it is not possible to put forward claims under the rules and customs known to international law. There has been a net acquisition of territory. What the representative of India has said about the surrender of 2,000 square miles of Pakistan is another example of auto-suggestion to which his government is so susceptible.

The Sino-Pakistan Boundary Agreement has been hailed throughout the world by the governments and the press as a statesmanlike settlement.

Let me reiterate that the Sino-Pakistan Boundary Agreement does not affect the status of the territory of Jammu and Kashmir. It does not derogate from the imperative of demilitarization of the State as required by the UNCIP resolutions. It does not detract one jot or tittle from the right of self-determination of the people of Jammu and Kashmir. Article 6 of the Boundary Agreement specifically safeguards all these matters. Let me quote from this article:

> "The two parties have agreed that after the settlement of the Kashmir dispute between Pakistan and India, the sovereign authority concerned will reopen negotiations with the Government of the People's Republic of China on the boundary, as described in Article 2 of the present Agreement, so as to sign a formal Boundary Treaty to replace the present Agreement; provided that in the event of that sovereign authority being Pakistan, the provisions of the present Agreement and of the aforesaid Protocol shall be maintained in the formal Boundary Treaty to be signed between the People's Republic of China and Pakistan".

It was not necessary for us to introduce this proviso, but we did it only because we knew that this dispute was in the Security Council and it had to be determined by this world organization. We left the proviso there that if the Security Council or if the plebiscite were to be determined in favour of India, India would have an opportunity and a legal right and legal claim to re-negotiate the boundary agreement with the People's Republic of China.

The representative of India has again repeated the thesis which he put forward in the Security Council last February that:

> "In the context of what has recently happened in Kashmir, it is vital to India not only for recovering the territory which China has unlawfully occupied, but also for resisting future aggression by China. The defence of Ladakh, which is North-East Kashmir, against the continuing menace of China is impossible except through Kashmir."

Here we have yet another argument, conjured up by India as to why Kashmir must be held in bondage regardless of the right of self-determination and the solemn international agreement to respect that right to which India is pledged. The representative of India maintains that Kashmir has now assumed vital importance for India's defence against China. Here then, is a dangerous doctrine. Self-determination and sanctity of international agreements must give way to the considerations of military strategy and the neo-colonial avarice of India. The members of the Security Council have only to cast a glance at the map of the region to realize the hollowness of this contention. It is not through Ladakh or the Vale of Kashmir that the security of of India can or will be threatened. There are easier and more obvious invasion routes to the heart of India. In the name of the defence of India, India seeks to negate the Charter of the United Nations by invoking the doctrine

of real politik. Who is speaking the language of Hitler and Goebbels? Which country has taken a leaf out of the infamous pages of Mein Kampf?

You must hold the people of Kashmir in bondage because you fear that you cannot defend India adequately against China unless and until you chain the people of Kashmir. Today you want to chain the people of Kashmir. Tomorrow you will want to chain the people of Nepal, of East Pakistan, and of West Pakistan in order for you to defend yourselves against Communist China. This is the most dangerous and most notorious doctrine that has been propounded in the Security Council.

For many years India has sought to project her image abroad as a country which is working to prevent war, to reduce world tension, to wipe out colonialism and to espouse the rights of small states against the great powers. But from time to time the reality behind this image becomes exposed. The representative of India, carried away by the violence of his diatribes against Pakistan, invokes doctrines which stronger states propound to impose their will on weaker ones. Imperialism has found no difficulty in clothing itself with philosophical justification for the evil that it inflicts. In 1962, in a diplomatic note addressed to the Chinese Government, the Government of India formally stated that it had a common border with the People's Republic of China right from the Pamir Mountains in the northwest to the borders of Burma, thereby claiming that not only Kashmir, but also Nepal, Sikkim, Bhutan and even parts of Burma were within the borders of India. This false and outrageous claim, like the one now made by the representative of India, was also a revelation of the inner thinking of the Government of India—that all the neighbouring smaller states and territories must remain within the Indian sphere of influence or domination because they are "necessary" to the defence of India against China.

You may usurp and devour all the smaller states, but you can never, never under any circumstances, dominate the spirit of the people of Pakistan. They shall always stand by the liberation of the people of Kashmir and all the smaller states in the name of the liberty and freedom of the peoples of those regions.

The world is perhaps not ignorant of the reasons why India strikes the posture of a nation bent on recovering by war territory from China. This stance is, of course, intended to impress the Western powers while, simultaneously, negotiations for a peaceful settlement are carried on by proxy through the Colombo Powers with the Peoples' Republic of China. This dual policy—to talk publicly of war with China and at the same time to put forward privately proposals for a negotiated settlement of the Sino-Indian border dispute—is obviously pursued to obtain the best of both worlds and, in particular, to procure massive military assistance from the Western world while maintaining a facade of non-alignment. How long can the world

be taken in by such double-faced conduct?

India looks upon the problem of Kashmir as a case in property law, a case of real property. In the revealing analogy drawn by the Education Minister of India, his country's position in Kashmir is that of the rightful owner of a house, deed and title to which have been duly assigned and delivered to India by the previous owner, the Maharaja of Kashmir. The Minister of Education of India found it appropriate to describe Pakistan's role in Kashmir as that of a burglar. But Pakistan comes before this Council not as a burglar nor as a self-proclaimed proprietor nor as a feudal lord of Kashmir. We come here, and have come before you year after year, with the simple proposition that Kashmir is not a piece of property, that its fate is not to be sealed or signed away through any instrument of accession, deed of transfer or other such transaction that has to be registered in a court of law; that it is rather the free will of the inhabitants—Muslims, Hindus, Sikhs or Christians—and their free will alone, which has to be determined and decided. It is not real estate; it does not involve property law and it does not have to be registered in a court of law. It is the will of the people that has to be determined.

Over the years, India has sought here, before this organ of international peace, and in the world at large, to establish its proprietary right over Kashmir. It has tried to spin a web of pseudo-legalistic arguments in which to entangle for ever the people of Kashmir. The voice of Kashmir, so long muted, is heard again, telling India clearly and unmistakably that Kashmir is not property, nor its four million people loot or booty; that the right of self-determination must prevail, and it must prevail in Kashmir as it has prevailed elsewhere. The Minister of Education of India complains that the Council's consistent support of this principle over the years is to be ascribed to nothing but the blindness of some and the indulgence of others. Let him not deceive himself in seeking to deceive the world.

It is too late for India to seek sympathy for the doctrines which, in the last century, apportioned the countries of Asia and Africa among alien "owners". Today the world is on guard against attempts to appropriate territory on the basis of self-promulgated laws, for the self-appointed task of good governance, or on the pretext of national defence and strategy.

The Minister of Education of India addressed a set of questions to the members of the Council regarding the rights of Pakistan in Kashmir. The Council has, by word and deed, given clear answers to these questions. The Council may wish once again to remind the Education Minister of India of the resolutions adopted by it in the past on the question of Jammu and Kashmir.

The world-wide support given to the cause of justice and the peoples right in Kashmir is not a certificate of good character to Pakistan. Pakistan seeks

no such certificates; much less is it my intention to follow the example of my colleague from India in myself giving a certificate of good character to my own country. I shall gladly leave to him the enjoyment of the solitary virtues of self-righteousness and self-esteem. I leave it to our friends in Africa and Asia to ponder over the invitation extended to them to "look askance" at Pakistan's support of Afro-Asian causes because of Pakistan's membership of SEATO and CENTO. I will refrain also from going into the nature of India's non-alignment, its expediency, its practical utility and profitability on which the world has gained new insights in the last few years. As for Pakistan's alignment and alliances, the truth is plain for all to see that they have not stood in the way of Pakistan in its pursuit of its policy of friendship with all countries of the world, irrespective of their ideology, political beliefs, or social systems. Nor have our engagements towards our allies prevented us from taking issue with them on questions of principle. Our support of the freedom movements in Africa and Asia has never wavered.

As regards apartheid, we have opposed this evil doctrine since the beginning, side by side with all right thinking countries, not excluding India. Of course, since Pakistan, like the vast majority of African and Asian countries, was not a member of the United Nations in 1946, we are not in a position to claim the chronological honour of being the first to have raised the issue in the United Nations.

The representative of India was anxious to disclose that all trade relations between Pakistan and South Africa have not yet ceased. We are not here discussing apartheid or the question of sanctions against South Africa. These matters have been discussed in other forums and, as shortly after the present debate terminates, the Security Council will turn its attention to finding ways and means of compelling South Africa to end its intransigence and its persistent disregard of United Nations resolutions on the matter. On the question of Pakistan's trade with South Africa, I would like to put on record—and this is of course already widely known through the letter addressed by Pakistan to the Secretary-General—that while imports and commercial relations of all kinds between Pakistan and South Africa have been completely banned, the question of stopping Pakistan's exports to South Africa is receiving the most active and urgent attention of my government. In passing, I would like to draw the attention of the members to document A/AC.115/L.55, dated March 5, 1964, which contains statistical tables of South Africa's foreign trade. A study of this document shows, India's so-called boycott notwithstanding, that India continues to trade with South Africa.

We have, in our previous statements before the Security Council, already dealt with the lack of legality in the Maharaja's accession to India and with the fact that the accession of Kashmir to Pakistan or to India can be decided

only by the people of Jammu and Kashmir. By saying that the accession to India, effected by the Maharaja, makes Kashmir irrevocably a part of India. India knows, or should know, that India does not establish any link between India and Kashmir, because no link can be established by pseudo-arguments. But what India does by this kind of rhetoric is to bring into question the very basis of India's nationhood, to throw into doubt the nexus that holds the Indian nation together. Kashmir is no part of India; therefore, by allowing it to decide its own future, India does not suffer the loss or secession of a part of it, and the Indian nation as such remains inviolate. But by opposing Kashmir's act of self-determination, by equating Kashmir with the constituent states of India, like, say, Madras, by saying that if Kashmir goes, Madras will also go, India will not keep Kashmir but it might weaken its link with Madras. It is not by fulfulling a pledge solemnly given by its government in an international agreement that India will lose its integrity. It is by opposing the fulfilment of this pledge that India runs a risk of disintegration.

Let the Indian representative pretend as much righteous indignation as he may, the fact remains that we do not seek the disintegration of the Indian Union. What we seek is a conformity to the principles of the Charter, a scrupulous discharge of international commitments, and a recourse to concrete methods and procedures for the settlement of international disputes. What we seek is a practical demonstration of the principle of the sovereign equality of nations in the sub-continent. What we seek is the restoration of that equipoise in the relations between India and Pakistan which will remove grievances and banish fear from the mind of each other. In sum, what we seek is the abandonment of those policies of the Indian Government which, being contrary to the principles of organized international life, not only weaken India's moral fibre but also act as a drain on its strength and on ours.

There is one lesson writ large in the history of the post-colonial age. It is that when imperialist powers have gracefully renounced their colonies, they have not lost but gained in strength. They have gained in it, not only in moral terms, but in prestige; not only in greater coherence of national life, but also in concrete terms of economics. By maintaining the possession of a land which resents this possession, by stifling the personality of a people whose affiliations lie elsewhere, a country drains its resources and dissipates its strength.

I have been accused by the Indian representative of threatening a breach of the peace in the event that India again resorts to the suppression of the people of Jammu and Kashmir by force. We asked that the situation in Kashmir be brought under the control of the United Nations. Would a nation that intended to resort to force want a situation to be brought under the control of the United Nations?

The representative of India says that Pakistan is working for a breach of the peace. The peace plan for Kashmir, as embodied in the UNCIP resolutions, is not a breach of the peace. Is our consistent adherence to these resolutions a preparation for the breach of the peace? What prevents a final and definite settlement of the Kashmir problem? Our attitude or India's attitude? We ask for an impartial investigation of the situation in Kashmir. Is that a threat? We ask for negotiations which should be sincere and constructive and meaningful, and that attempts be made to bring about that negotiation. Is that a threat? We ask for mediation with such precise terms of reference as will give an impetus to negotiations and make them coherent and peaceful. Are we then threatening a breach of the peace? We declare ourselves as willing to submit certain points of difference to arbitration. Are we then working for a breach of the peace? We ask that the resources of the United Nations should not be left untapped for the resolution of the problem; we urge that its procedures be not rejected. Is that a threat of war from us? India prevents investigation; India impedes negotiations; India blocks mediation; India rejects arbitration; and, to crown it all, the Indian representative says that any assistance given by the United Nations, or its high personality, in the settlement of this dispute is intervention by third parties. The methods of peaceful settlement embedded in the United Nations system and prescribed by the Charter are the only alternatives to war. India blocks these alternatives. Is it not then provoking war?

It was an Indian representative who, speaking in a different context, once charged that a certain foreign power had—and I quote:

> "consistently violated international law and the United Nations Charter which forced India to take action by barring all other avenues . ."

Is that not precisely what India is doing in the Kashmir dispute? Is it not "barring all other avenues" by rejecting every one of the methods of the pacific settlement of disputes? India protests even against the Security Council exercising its persuasive powers for the resolution of this dispute. What consequence would naturally follow from this attitude? It is one of our basic difficulties with India that India adopts a certain attitude and takes certain actions of which the consequences can be easily foreseen, but then it blames those consequences on others.

Of course, the Education Minister of India made the generous offer, towards the end of his speech, that India will find it possible to discuss with Pakistan our outstanding differences when a better atmosphere is established.

Here again, we are confronted with the basic malady in the relationship between India and Pakistan. India demands a better atmosphere, but blocks every move and every step that would bring about that better atmosphere. The question disturbs us and it should concern the Security Council. What does India mean by a better atmosphere? Does it not take two to establish

a better atmosphere? Does it not require a sincere and constructive effort for the settlement of disputes? Does it not necessitate a recourse to the methods laid down in the Charter for the purpose? If not, are we supposed to undergo a catharsis which will qualify us for meaningful negotiations with India? And is this atmosphere a matter of subjective judgment by India?

By making a better atmosphere the condition for talks, when it can be only their result, India does something far worse than putting the cart before the horse; it is making it impossible for the two countries to make even a beginning towards the settlement of the dispute.

It has been our experience during the last seventeen years that, no matter how hard we try to establish an atmosphere of moderation between India and Pakistan, our attempts are undone by the lack of any progress towards the settlement of the dispute over Jammu and Kashmir. This happened in 1950; it happened in 1953 and 1954; it happened in 1956, and it was what made the sustained endeavour of our President from 1958 to 1961 to place the relationship of India and Pakistan on a neighbourly basis a wholly one-sided effort by Pakistan. Now that the situation in Jammu and Kashmir is coming to a head, it would be fatuous to expect, and sheer hypocrisy to promise, a better atmosphere unless the dispute is moved rapidly towards a peaceful and honourable settlement.

Members of the Security Council will recall that, on numerous occasions, India's representatives have taken the line that Pakistan has no *locus standi* in the problem of deciding Kashmir's future. Now, the Indian representative informs us that, on this problem, Kashmir has no *locus standi* either, for he has taken the line that a leader of the people of Kashmir should have nothing to say on the problem.

It is to be borne in mind in this context that when India argues that the integration of Kashmir with the Indian Union is India's internal constitutional matter, it is saying in effect that, in this matter, the Security Council has no *locus standi.* So India robs us all of our *locus standi.* There exists an international agreement regarding the disposition of the State of Jammu and Kashmir. According to India, neither Pakistan—the other party to the agreement—nor Kashmir—the party that is most affected by the agreement—nor the Security Council—the organ under whose authority the agreement was concluded—has any *locus standi.* Only India has a *locus standi* in Kashmir. Could any country be more determined against a settlement of the dispute by peaceful means?

In regard to the opinions of Sheikh Abdullah on the central issue of the Kashmir dispute—namely, self-determination, accession, plebiscite, passage of time, integration, and negotiations for a peaceful settlement, which I quoted in my statement to the Security Council on May 5,—the representa-

tive of India tells us that these opinions are not admissible evidence and that only what the Kashmiri leader stated between 1947 and 1949 has any evidential value.

I am aware that the representative of India has long experience of the application of the Indian Evidence Act, but may I remind him that he and I are not engaged in proceedings in a court of law in either his country or mine. We are discussing Kashmir and the implementation of the right of self-determination of the people of Jammu and Kashmir in the forum of the Security Council. This is their inalienable human and political right, to be exercised as an act of their free and collective will.

As the representative of India is so wedded to rules of evidence and the Indian Evidence Act, may I remind him that the statements of Sheikh Abdullah before the Security Council in 1948 and 1949, as well as those which he made in 1952, were no part of the transaction of the so-called accession. Therefore, those statements are not admissible under the strict rules of the Evidence Act which he has applied in the Indian courts for so long. On the other hand, if the statements made by Sheikh Abdullah long after the accession, in 1948, 1949 and 1952, quoted by the representative of India, are relevant, then his most recent statements which I quoted on May 5, are even more relevant to the present situation in Jammu and Kashmir which is the subject of this series of Security Council meetings.

If the Representative of India considers that the rules of evidence should be applied strictly in this international forum, if he were presiding as a judge in the Security Council instead of you, Mr. President, why does he not agree to let Sheikh Abdullah appear to testify before the Council as to what exactly are his views on the central issue of the Kashmir dispute? I request the Council again to invite Sheikh Abdullah to appear before it and hear from him directly what he has to say.

In my statement on May 5, I quoted extensively from Sheikh Abdullah's recent statements and summarized the affirmations contained in them. The point of my quoting these affirmations was that they have been massively acclaimed by the people of Kashmir. It is the acceptance and acclamation of these statements by the people of Jammu and Kashmir, as much as their content, that furnishes a true indication of the situation existing in Jammu and Kashmir today. In fact, these statements are the most faithful reflection we have of that situation and, therefore, they are an essential part of the record before the Security Council. Unable to face them the Minister of Education of India has attempted to negate their effects by two arguments. The first is that "the opinions of any person, however distinguished or eminent, cannot alter or affect the question of the status of a territory". The second rests on Sheikh Abdullah's previous statements made from 1947 to 1952. I shall deal with both these arguments.

As regards the first argument, it is evidently not applicable here. The affirmations made by Sheikh Abdullah are important because, far from being the voice of one individual, they echo the unanimous demand of the five million people of Jammu and Kashmir. Moreover, these affirmations are made by the person who was cited by India itself as having supported the Maharajah's accession to India. The records of the Security Council will bear out that, in India's original representation to the Security Council made on January 1, 1948, Sheikh Abdullah was specifically mentioned as the leader who appealed for help to India. Surely then, Sheikh Abdullah should be able to throw a good deal of light on the terms and assumptions of this appeal. Indeed, even in the statement of the Indian representative on May 7, there is again a recognition of Sheikh Abdullah's status. The Indian representative has said that the accession was "accompanied by the consent of the people expressed through Sheikh Abdullah who was the leader of the largest party in Kashmir." Surely, then, it is important to get a description of the nature of this consent from the person who is supposed to have expressed it.

As regards Sheikh Abdullah's previous statements made from 1947 to 1952, I am glad that the Indian Minister of Education brought them on record again. A juxtaposition of these statements with those that Sheikh Abdullah has made since and those which he is making now only helps one to realize how cruel must have been the disillusionment, how sharp the sense of betrayal, which Sheikh Abdullah suffered because of India's continued occupation of Jammu and Kashmir in breach of its commitments. Far from weakening Sheikh Abdullah's current stand, his previous statements reinforce it by demonstrating that this stand is not based on any prejudice or any preconceived notions, but is the result of experience.

During his statement, the representative of India quoted Sheikh Abdullah's statement of April 17, 1964 and, even in that statement, there occurs a sentence:

> "It is the Government of India which I feel has gone back from its commitments . . . "

This is Shekih Abdullah's statement of April 17, 1964, being quoted by the Indian Minister. The Education Minister read the sentence and added: "that is another matter." The point here is, and Sheikh Abdullah would be the first to make it, that this is not another matter. It is the very heart and core of the Kashmir issue that India has gone back on its commitments.

Apart from this, there is another aspect of Sheikh Abdullah's statements which needs to be borne in mind. It has been brought out by Sheikh Abdullah himself. According to the Indian Express, Bombay, of May 4, Sheikh Abdullah was asked whether it was not a fact that he had been responsible for the Maharajah's accession to India. The question, in fact, was how he

could square his statements then with his statements now. His answer was:

> "Yes I supported accession to India before 1953. But it is not bringing peace to the sub-continent. When it did not bring peace to the sub-continent, what value did it have?"

The representative of India also tried to take comfort from a recent statement of Sheikh Abdullah that a plebiscite was not the only method for ascertaining the wishes of the people of Jammu and Kashmir. But, unfortunately for the Indian representative, this statement has been clarified now by Sheikh Abdullah and, as explained by him, it does not lend the slightest support to India's argument against a plebiscite. According to the Hindustan Times of May 7, Sheikh Abdullah said that elections could be a solution of the dispute if they were fair and free and organized by a neutral third party so that nobody could point a finger at India. He added that India, being an interested party, should not be in Kashmir if and when elections were held and that the result of these elections must be acceptable to Pakistan ; otherwise no purpose would be served. He further said that there should be a disengagement of the forces of India and Pakistan preceding these elections ; otherwise present tension would continue.

I believe that this statement of Sheikh Abdullah should invite some reflection on the part of the Indian representative. Sheikh Abdullah lays down the following conditions for elections being a solution of the problem: first, they must be free and fair ; second, they must be organized by a neutral party ; third, Indian forces should withdraw from Jammu and Kashmir to enable those elections to be impartial; fourth, their result must be acceptable to Pakistan; and fifth, they must be preceded by the disengagement of the forces of India and Pakistan in Jammu and Kashmir. What is this formula except a restatement of the principles of the UNCIP resolutions? These provide that a plebiscite should be preceded by the withdrawal of the forces of India and Pakistan from Jammu and Kashmir and should be held under the direction and control of the United Nations to ensure its fairness, freedom, and impartiality. The condition cannot be avoided that a settlement must be based on the wishes of the people which are impartially ascertained and are seen so to be ascertained.

I must recall here that, in my statement of March 17, I said that if one were to consider the Kashmir problem as it has arisen now, not in 1948, but today, and would embark on a search, however pragmatic, for an equitable settlement, one would be driven to the conclusion that there is only one way—the way of finding out what the people of Jammu and Kashmir themselves want. I added that one would thus be driven to write again the substance of the UNCIP resolutions. Sheikh Abdullah's statement about what conditions are essential for ascertaining the wishes of the people

brings out the truth of my submission.

The representative of India tried to make much of the argument that Sheikh Abdullah's release establishes that there is democracy and freedom in India and that the Government of India is perfectly confident that the situation is normal in the State of Jammu and Kashmir. This argument had been anticipated by numerous statements made by the spokesmen of the Government of India. All of them expressed the hope that the release of Sheikh Abdullah would wash India of all the taint that it has borne for eleven years and would help its case in the Security Council.

Unfortunately, however, these statements only serve to strengthen the conclusion that—as I said in my last statement—this act of releasing Sheikh Abdullah was not a gesture of magnanimity on India's part. They corroborate the comment in the Economist, London, of April 4,—which I quoted in my last statement—that the Indian Government has not had a sudden rush of liberalism to the head. There is no change of heart on the part of India and there is no ground for the members of the Security Council to feel that, by releasing Sheikh Abdullah, India might have made a gesture towards reconciliation with Pakistan and towards the resolution of the conflict in Jammu and Kashmir.

The Indian representative demonstrates before us that this act is purely a manoeuvre—the Prime Minister of India has called it a "calculated risk" —to prove normalcy where none exists. It is obvious that their hope, at the time of releasing Sheikh Abdullah, was that he would "blow off steam" and then subside and the situation in Jammu and Kashmir would thus simmer down. This hope is already being falsified by events. I referred to certain developments in Kashmir in my last statement. The Indian representative has vehemently denied my statement that a curfew was imposed last week in several towns in Jammu and Kashmir. Let me assure him that my statement was based on information obtained, not from our sources but from the Indian newspapers. According to the Statesman of Delhi of May 9, there were demonstrations in Srinagar on last Friday, shouting, "Hold a plebiscite immediately".

The Indian representative argues, "Well, there are demonstrations, so what?". The answer is that these demonstrations do not signify merely a dissatisfaction with this or that policy of the Indian Government; they are not in protest against this or that administration. They signify a rebellion against India's occupation of the State. The Indian representative reminds us that demonstrations take place in all democratic countries. But he evidently runs away from the fact that there is a basic difference between normal demonstrations in democratic countries and those that are taking place in Jammu and Kashmir. If demonstrations are the expression of a specific grievance or if they protest against a specific policy, they are nor-

mal demonstrations. But, when they are held by the people of a territory whose status is in dispute, rejecting annexation forced on them and demanding that they be enabled immediately to decide their status by a plebiscite, what are they except a revolt?

Actually, the unspoken point in the Indian argument is that the revolt in Jammu and Kashmir is unarmed and that, if it goes on, India has an overwhelming military might in Jammu and Kashmir to suppress it. That is the root of the confidence that the Indian representative expresses here. But what does this point do except bring out the explosive nature of the present situation. When, in reality, India relies on her military might, India compels all those who sympathize with the revolt of the people of Jammu and Kashmir to conclude that nothing is so urgently desirable as effective resistance against the forces of suppression in Jammu and Kashmir.

In countering my statements about the revolt in Kashmir, the Indian representative supported his argument by the observation that there is complete intercommunal unity in Jammu and Kashmir. This is an astonishing reply. That the Indian representative should rely on this argument shows to what straits he has been driven in points of logic. If Hindus and Moslems live at peace with each other in Jammu and Kashmir—we are proud and gratified that they do—does it mean that they do not resent India's occupation of the State? What has intercommunal unity to do with the demand of the people of Kashmir that they be enabled to decide their future for themselves?

Apart from this, it is obvious that it is not the ventilation of the people's demand in Kashmir, but its fulfilment alone that can bring about normalcy. Apart from suppressing the people by force for many years, the Indian Government has been driven to the point where it feels that force is not enough. The present situation is merely that it is resorting to other means to frustrate the people's demand. It is not doing anything to meet this demand. As long as it does not do so, the protestations of freedom and democracy are not only baseless, but, in the face of the combined voice of the people of Jammu and Kashmir, utterly irrelevant.

The Indian representative harps on the differences of outlook between India and Pakistan. Let me tell him that he does not enhance his country's reputation by these assertions. We in Pakistan have our faults, and I suppose that, in the final analysis, they can be overcome only by greater education, enlightenment, and economic advance. But whatever they are, they are open, perhaps even blatant, and, therefore, eradicable.

The Indian representative's statement is a demonstration of the fact that there is something in the Indian mentality which is insidious and, therefore, impenetrable. It is a mentality so wrapped in national conceit,

so enfolded in a holier-than-thou attitude, that it is small wonder that we in Pakistan sometimes succumb to despair about the future of our relations with our neighbour. They know that fanaticism is stalking their land; they know that their democracy so far is not more than a facade because it is not yet based on the habits of tolerance, yet they come here treating us to sermons about the loftiness of their society and of their souls.

We do not claim Kashmir on the ground that we are a better society. The United Nations is not here to award Kashmir as a prize for better performance to either India or Pakistan. We say that whatever we are, and whatever the Indians are, ask the Kashmiris whom they want to join. Let India marshal all its arguments against Kashmir's accession to Pakistan, but let these arguments be addressed to the people of Jammu and Kashmir at the time of plebiscite, and let them decide. If India believed in democracy, it would have long ago accepted this challenge.

Members of the Security Council will have noticed how the Indian Minister for Education has reacted to the peace appeal that I made at the conclusion of my remarks on May 5. When I pleaded with India that an end must come to our bitterness, that there is a time for struggle and a time to settle, I meant every word of what I said. The Indian representative spurned and even ridiculed my appeal, but I must inform him that he has not provoked me into withdrawing it. I again transmit the message of my people to the people of India that it is within our power to transform the climate of our two countries, not by waving a magic wand, but by recourse to those concrete procedures which alone can rationally bring about the resolution of international conflicts.

We do not make it a condition for the settlement of our disputes that India must get rid of its caste system, we do not make it a condition that India should abandon its mythology, renounce its whole philosophy and reorientate its entire culture. We take India as it is and its outlook and aspirations as they stand, and we seek a *modus vivendi* with it which, once established, might develop into a normal relationship.

We may be theocratic or mediaeval or backward, but we offer India those ways and means of establishing a rational relationship between our two countries which are eminently secular and modern. What credit can be given to protestations of secularism and modernity if one is impervious to the counsels of mediation and conciliation and arbitration—all modern and secular ways of regulating international life? Let the Indian representative ponder this question and not be too preoccupied with the thought that I am putting it to him.

Address to the One Thousand One Hundred and Seventeenth Meeting of the Security Council on May 18, 1964

Mr. President,

With your permission I take this opportunity to place on record my government's appreciation of the efforts that have been made by you personally and by the other members of the Council during the last three months for at least helping to move the Kashmir dispute towards a settlement. Whatever the result, there is no doubt that these efforts have enlisted our gratitude. Personally, I feel much obliged to you and to all your colleagues for your unfailing courtesy.

Now that the debate has been terminated for the time being without any statement of agreed conclusions, I do not consider it necessary to comment on the summation which my delegation has just heard. Therefore the question of accepting it does not arise. However, we feel it our duty to stress what seems to us to be the constructive elements in the debate.

Taken as a whole, as this has to be done and has been done, and comprising the discussions we have heard in February, in March, and in May, the debate contained two outstanding elements. First, it is evident that the members of the Council, without exception, have expressed the Council's deep concern with the situation in Jammu and Kashmir and have also made it clear that the Council has a real, continuing obligation to bring about a peaceful settlements of this dispute. Second, it has been a major theme in the pronouncements of the members of the Council that no settlement of the dispute will be genuine and durable if it does not take into account the wishes of the people of Jammu and Kashmir as pledged to them by India, Pakistan, and the United Nations. The axiomatic nature of these considerations does not detract from their substantive importance. We believe that their enunciation in the Security Council will serve as the background to

further developments in the situation.

As regards negotiations, I have explained to the Council our long and not very encouraging experience of this particular process. We have tried this method over and over again—in 1950, in 1953, in 1954, in 1956, in 1959 to 1961, and most recently through intensive talks in 1962 and 1963. That all these efforts failed shows that it is not within our power alone to make negotiations sincere, constructive and meaningful, and further that they cannot be made so without the essential frame of reference of the wishes of the people of Jammu and Kashmir, which are paramount.

We asked for prompt and tangible assistance from the Security Council in the effort towards an early settlement, and it was our expectation that the Security Council would be a positive and material factor in the situation. We had hoped that the Council would firmly lay down the framework within which contacts between India and Pakistan should be carried on for a solution of the problem of Jammu and Kashmir. We would also have liked a definite role to be assigned to the Secretary-General to enable him to facilitate the progress and to ensure a fruitful result of these contacts. A settlement of the dispute is possible only in accordance with the wishes of the people of Jammu and Kashmir, as pledged to them by India, Pakistan, and the United Nations.

Should we pay heed to the principles of the Charter, or should we base ourselves on power and aggrandizement? Should we work for a just and durable peace, or should we obey the expediencies of the moment, and thus barter away the future tranquillity of the four million people of Jammu and Kashmir?

The answer is plain, and it is stated fully in the UNCIP resolutions which remain valid, and in no other formulation or rostrum. This is what makes it essential to make these resolutions the basis of our efforts towards an honourable settlement.

As we go back, we can confidently state that since the situation in Jammu and Kashmir has now entered a phase in which it cannot be left to take care of itself, we take leave of the Council for the time being and we trust that the Council will keep the developments in the situation under its close and continued vigilance.

The summation by the President is neither a consensus nor a statement of agreed conclusions. As such, we consider it to be a purely descriptive and factual statement which the President of the Council has made, and not any kind of recommendation to the parties with any binding force. The question of our accepting or rejecting it, therefore, does not arise.

Address to the Twelve Hundred and Forty-Fourth Meeting of the Security Council on September 22, 1965

Mr. President,

I am thankful to you and to the members of the Security Council for having met at this late hour to discuss a matter of vital importance to my people, to the sub-continent, to Asia, and perhaps to the world at large. In expressing my gratitude I would like to address not only the permanent members but also the other members of the Security Council for having taken the trouble to be with us this morning. I have come direct from Pakistan, and I have requested this meeting because the issues that face us are indeed so fundamental and important that it is necessary for us to meet to dilate upon them.

I am thankful also to the Secretary-General for his endeavours to bring about a meaningful settlement between India and Pakistan. We are aware of all his efforts; we are grateful to him and to the Security Council; we are grateful to all peace-loving countries for having taken such a direct interest in a war which we do not want, which has been imposed on us by a predatory aggressor.

Pakistan is a small country. You have only to look at a map of the world and see our size to be aware of our resources and our ability.

We are facing a great monster, a great aggressor always given to aggression. During the sixteen or seventeen years of our independence we have seen India commit aggression time and again. Ever since 1947, India has followed the road of aggression. It committed aggression against Junagadh, against Manavadar, against Mongrol, against Hyderabad and against Goa. It brought about a situation which has caused the Sino-Indian conflict. It has committed aggression against Pakistan. And Pakistan, according to Indian leaders, is its enemy number one. Pakistan is supposed to be the

country which is the fulcrum of India's fundamental policies.

From 1947 we have been faced with this situation. We have always known that India is determined to annihilate Pakistan.

Pakistan's basic principle was the bringing about of a permanent settlement between the two major communities. For seven hundred years we sought to achieve equilibrium between the people of the two major communities. We believed eventually that the only way to live in lasting peace with India was to establish our own homeland, to establish a country smaller in area, but nevertheless capable of having a relationship, a *modus vivendi,* with a great and powerful neighbour. That was one of the prime factors responsible for the creation of Pakistan. We know that in Europe certain countries have had to separate in order to get closer together; Sweden and Norway, for instance, had to separate in order to get close to one another. We believed that with the creation of Pakistan we would be able to establish a permanent peace, a permanent understanding, between the people of India and the people of Pakistan.

We are a smaller country and, as I said, our resources are limited; one has only to look at a map of the world and a map of the sub-continent to see that. We are not interested in war. We do not want aggression; we do not want conflict. We want peace in order that our people can develop. This is the age of rising expectation. We should like to see all our energies and all our efforts directed towards economic well-being. It is not the law of God that people in Asia and Africa should be poor. It is not a predestined rule or an immutable law that they should always remain in poverty. We want to break the barriers of poverty; we want to give our people a better life; we want our children to have a better future.

The leaders of Asia and Africa are determined to break the barriers and legacies of the past. In order to do so we must channel all our resources for productive ends, for a peaceful and purposeful future. This is a dire need for a country such as Pakistan.

We do not want conflict. We are not for war. We do not want to see the extermination of peoples. We respect and have regard for the people of India. A few years ago we were part of the same country, but, for the reason which I have stated, we were obliged to separate. By means of separation we had thought that our people would be brought closer together, that we would bring about harmony, understanding and tranquillity. The basic idea in the creation of Pakistan was that the areas occupied by the Muslim majority should form Pakistan. This basic principle was accepted by the Indian leaders. All we ask is to live in peace, friendship and goodwill with India on the basis of the understanding and agreements which the Indian Government and the Indian leaders themselves solemnly pledged to my people and my country.

Today we are fighting a war, a war imposed on us by India, a naked, predatory, unwarranted aggression by 450 million people against 100 million people, a war of chauvinism and aggrandisement by a mighty neighbour against a smaller country. It is as if, in Europe, France or Germany committed aggression against Denmark. It is as if a small country in South America were subjected to aggression by Argentina or Brazil. It is as if the United States waged a war against a small country.

We do not want to be exterminated. We cherish life. We want to live; we want our people to live; we want our people to progress. But today our cities are being bombed indiscriminately by the might of India, by the formidable machine of the Indian armed forces.

This will not, however, deter us from seeking justice. We are resolved to fight for our honour, to fight for Pakistan, because we are the victims of aggression. Aggression has been committed against the soil of Pakistan. Irrespective of our size, irrespective of our resources, we have the resolve, we have the will, to fight because ours is a just cause. Ours is a righteous cause. We are wedded to principle. We are wedded to our own pledges. We believe in the right of self-determination—a Wilsonian right, as I told you this evening, Sir, a concept which has inspired the whole of Asia and Africa. It is a phenomenon that cannot be stopped; and that is why we are fighting. We are fighting with our backs to the wall, but we shall fight with all determination, irrespective of the odds and of all the forces that are pitted against us.

The Secretary-General, as I have already said, has made some very constructive suggestions, and we are grateful to him. He is not only the Secretary-General of the United Nations, he is also a great Asian from a great Asian neighbour of Pakistan and of India. And we should like to co-operate with him both in his capacity as the Secretary-General and as a leader of a great Asian country. We have had useful discussions with him in Pakistan, and we told him that we are for peace.

We do not want war, we do not want destruction and we do not want disaster. But it should be a meaningful peace, a purposeful peace, a peace for all time, a peace in which India and Pakistan can live as good neighbours. We are neighbours and we want to live as good neighbours. We do not want to have conflict and trouble with India for all time. No people would want that.

We are a smaller country. The cardinal principle of Pakistan's foreign policy has been to establish good-neighbourly relations with all countries, with all its neighbours—and India is our principal neighbour. All our efforts to establish good-neighbourly relations with all other countries would be in vain if we are not able to establish good-neighbourly relations with India, which, as I have said, for historical, political and geographical rea-

sons is our principal neighbour. We will make every endeavour to establish such relations. The Indian representative, whom I know well and for whom I have great regard, is aware of the efforts we have made to establish good-neighbourly relations with India. He knows that from the very beginning our President, from the time he came into office, has made positive gestures to India to establish good-neighbourly relations with his country. We have taken many initiatives to bring peace, tranquillity and friendship between Pakistan and India. These are matters of record, not a question of propaganda, of trying to get kudos. These are tangible and well-known facts of history: that ever since he has become President of Pakistan he has gone out of his way to establish good relations with India by co-operation in every field—co-operation in trade, in economics and in politics. Has the world forgotten that in 1959 it was the President of Pakistan who made an offer to India to disengage, to bring about a meaningful settlement so that our armies do not face each other in an eyeball-to-eyeball stance, so that we may take care of our own difficulties?

These are matters of record, matters of history. Thus we want good-neighbourly relations with India, we want peace with India and we want friendship with India. But that peace and friendship must be peace with honour and it must be peace of a self-respecting sovereign State. India must accept that. India must know that peace can be established only on the basis of self-respect and honour, on the basis of its own commitments, on the basis of its won pledges, on the basis of its own promises to the people of Pakistan, to the people of India, to the world at large and, above all, to the people of Jammu and Kashmir.

Jammu and Kashmir is not an integral part of India and has never been an integral part of India. Jammu and Kashmir is a territory disputed between India and Pakistan. It is more a part of Pakistan than it can ever be of India, with all the eloquence and with all the extravagance with words displayed by India. The people of Jammu and Kashmir are part of the people of Pakistan in blood, in flesh, in life—kith and kin of ours, in culture, in geography, in history and in every way and in every form. They are a part of the people of Pakistan.

We will wage war for a thousand years, a war of defence. I told that to the Security Council a year ago when that body, in all its wisdom and in all its power, was not prepared to give us even a resolution. The Security Council felt that we had brought a dead horse to this Council, that we were trying to make internal propaganda. But the world must know that the 100 million people of Pakistan will never abandon their pledges and promises. The Indians may abandon their pledges and promises; we shall never abandon ours, irrespective of our size and of our resources. We shall fight to the end, but we shall fight in self-defence; we shall fight for honour.

We are not aggressors, we are the victims of aggression. It was the duty of the Security Council to pronounce itself on who is the aggressor and who is the aggressed, It is Pakistan that is the victim of aggression.

I am not referring here to some of the remarks made by countries which have no right to be here; they are not even countries. I am referring to the great powers, I am referring to all peace-loving countries, I am referring to those who believe in the cause of justice, in the cause of righteousness and in the cause of honour. After all, history is not in vain. Wars have been fought in the past and people have upheld great causes. I am referring to the great powers and also to those other countries in the Security Council which have espoused the cause of righteousness. We are grateful to all of you for whatever you have done to uphold the cause of justice because, finally and ultimately, justice must prevail. We believe more than ever before that justice is bound to prevail for the people of Jammu and Kashmir. Five million people must have the right to decide their own future. Why should they be made an exception?

Should the whole phenomenon of self-determination, stretching from Asia and Africa, apply to the whole world excepting the people of Jammu and Kashmir? Are they some outcasts of Indian society? Are they some untouchable pariahs that they should not be given the right of self-determination, that they should not be allowed to have the right to their own future? The great country of France permitted the Algerians to exercise the right of self-determination. The right of self-determination is a Wilsonian concept. The Soviet Union believes in the right of self-determination of all peoples. The whole world believes in the right of self-determination. Must it be denied to the people of Jammu and Kashmir merely because power must prevail over principle? Power shall never prevail over principle. Finally and ultimately, principle must prevail over power. This is a Christian concept, it is an Islamic concept, it is a civilized concept. Those nations which do not believe in such a concept must face the ultimate consequences.

India is isolated today. India, in spite of its size and its resources, has no one to support it openly. The whole of Asia and Africa supports the right of self-determination of the people of Kashmir. The Arab countries, in Casablanca, have supported the right of self-determination for the people of Kashmir. European countries have supported the right of self-determination for the people of Kashmir. The Secretary of State of the United States of America, Mr. Dean Rusk, said that the historical position is a plebiscite in Kashmir. On the one hand, you have the whole world arrayed on the side of the cause of right and justice and morality, and, on the other hand, you have a war machine, an arrogant and chauvinistic State breaking its pledges, breaking its promises and wanting to destroy the will and the spirit of a people. The will and spirit of our people can never be destroy-

ed. Let me tell you: you can have one cease-fire, you can have another cease-fire, but the 100 million people of Pakistan shall face extermination rather than forsake their principles or allow their principles to be negated and destroyed by sheer force and power.

Having made those remarks, I have the honour to transmit the following message from the President of Pakistan, which I have just received from Rawalpindi.

"Pakistan considers Security Council resolution 211 of 20 September as unsatisfactory. However, in the interests of international peace and in order to enable the Security Council to evolve a self-executing procedure which will lead to an honourable settlement of the root cause of the present conflict"—

namely, the Jammu and Kashmir dispute—

"I have issued the following order to the Pakistan armed forces. They will stop fighting as from 1205 hours West Pakistan time today. As from that time they will not fire on enemy forces unless fired upon, provided the Indian Government issues similar orders to its armed forces..."

Thus, in response to the call of international peace and international goodwill, we have ordered our troops to cease hostilities, provided India agrees to such a cessation of hostilites.

But a cessation of hostilities is not enough. The Security Council—the most important organ of the United Nations—must now address itself to the heart of the problem. For eighteen years it has played and toyed with the future of Kashmir. It can no longer make a plaything or a toy out of 5 million people. It is the moral responsibility of the Security Council to address itself to a meaningful and lasting solution of the problem of Jammu and Kashmir.

The Security Council has been seized of this problem for eighteen years. There are more documents, more resolutions on Jammu and Kashmir—the most fundamental problem facing the world today—than on any other problem. Is it not ironical that with regard to a conflict that may lead to world conflagration— and the present situation has shown that it is possible for this conflict to lead to world conflagration—the Security Council has shown lethargy and indolence?

I was here a year ago, and the Security Council was not prepared to give Pakistan a piece of paper called a resolution. It did not even want to consider the problem. It thought that this was a dead issue, or that it was dormant. This can never be a dead issue; it can never be dormant.

This is now the last chance for the Security Council to put all its force, all its energy, all its moral responsibility behind a fair and equitable and honourable solution of the Jammu and Kashmir dispute. History does not wait for councils, organizations or institutions, just as it does not wait for

individuals. Ultimately we shall have to be the final determiners of our own course. Let me tell the Security Council, on behalf of my government, that if now, after this last chance that we are giving the Security Council, it does not put its full force, full moral responsibility and full weight behind an equitable and honourable settlement of the Jammu and Kashmir dispute, Pakistan will have to leave the United Nations.

We have decided to give the United Nations a last opportunity to determine what it can do towards a purposeful, peaceful and lasting settlement of the problem of Jammu and Kashmir. We shall give the United Nations a time-limit. Within a certain period of time, if the Security Council is not able to act in accordance with the responsibility placed on it, in accordance with its honour under the Charter which believes in self-determination, Pakistan will have to withdraw from the United Nations.

I am not saying that in the form of an ultimatum. I am saying it as I am honour bound to respect the very purposes of the Charter. In leaving the United Nations, Pakistan will be fulfilling the Charter of the United Nations. And then one third or more of the world will be outside this Organization.

Address to the Twelve Hundred and Forty-Seventh Meeting of the Security Council on October 25, 1965

Mr. President,

The consideration of the India-Pakistan question by the Security Council has now reached a stage which will be decisive, as much for the issue of war or peace in South Asia as for the effectiveness and authority of the United Nations.

I am grateful to the President and the other members of the Security Council for having convened this meeting, at our request, to consider the rapidly deteriorating situation between India and Pakistan. The reasons which prompted our request were the virtual collapse of the cease-fire and the total disregard by India of the letter and spirit of the Council's resolution of 20 September 1965. That resolution provided for various essential measures to facilitate an honourable settlement of the political problem underlying the conflict between India and Pakistan—namely, the Jammu and Kashmir dispute. It was stated authoritatively in the Council that the resolution stood as a whole and had to be implemented as such. It represented the Councils' commitment to secure a peaceful settlement of the dispute. That was emphasized by the members of the Council and also by numerous Member States speaking in the general debate of the current General Assembly session.

What is India's attitude to that commitment? As far as the world is concerned, today India has unmasked itself. It has said that it is not prepared to participate in the Council's deliberations if these go beyond paragraph 1 of the Security Council's resolution of 20 September. In other words, it shows contempt for the Council's resolution and the Council's authority. That fact is so plain that it needs no elaboration.

The Council is told that Jammu and Kashmir is an integral part of

India and that any discussion relating to it amounts to a gross interference in India's internal affairs. That is to say, the Council's deliberations for eighteen years, extending over more than 100 meetings, with all the statements made by its members, the resolutions adopted, the pledges given, the commitments solemnly entered into—all these are to be expunged because India has decided to annex Jammu and Kashmir and to repudiate unilaterally all its obligations.

Has any Power—South Africa included—in the history of the United Nations, gone further in its brazen defiance of the World Organization?

When the Council met on 27 September to consider the situation, it did so as a result of the Secretary-General's report that the cease-fire agreed to unconditionally by the Governments of India and Pakistan was not holding. The Council reaffirmed its previous resolution and demanded that the parties urgently honour their commitments to the Council to observe the cease-fire and withdraw their forces as necessary steps in the full implementation of the resolution of 20 September 1965.

Nearly a month has elapsed since the Council adopted its last resolution, but the cease-fire continues to be unstable and negotiations have still to begin on withdrawal of troops and a settlement of the political problem with regard to Jammu and Kashmir. In our submissions before the Council, we have consistently affirmed that, while a cease-fire and withdrawal of troops must necessarily form a part of the effort to reach a permanent settlement of the Jammu and Kashmir dispute, it was unrealistic, in political terms, to divorce the problem of the cessation of hostilities from that of settling the Jammu and Kashmir dispute.

The reason for this is not far to seek. One of the parties considers the cease-fire as something which merely facilitates its continued hold on the greater part of the State of Jammu and Kashmir. It is therefore unwilling to allow such stabilization of the cease-fire and withdrawal of troops as would permit the Council, as well as both parties to the dispute, to proceed with the task of finding a peaceful settlement of the dispute. It is for this reason that my delegation has constantly urged that the Council would be defeating even the immediate purpose which it had in mind if it allowed India to escape with the impression that the Council had resigned itself to the continuance of the *status quo* in Jammu and Kashmir.

It is also on this account that my Government has always urged the Council to remind the parties not merely of their duty to refrain from the use of force in their relations, in contravention of the United Nations Charter, but also of their responsibility to honour and implement in good faith the obligations and commitments undertaken by them under the United Nations resolutions which lay down the accepted and agreed solution of the Jammu and Kashmir dispute.

In its resolution of 20 September 1965 the Security Council demanded that India and Pakistan should issue orders for a cease-fire to take effect on 22 September at 7 a.m. Pakistan complied with it. India asked for an extension of the deadline by eighteen hours on the pretext of giving sufficient notice to local commanders. The Council agreed to extend the time-limit by fifteen hours. As we expected in Pakistan, India utilized this opportunity to improve its military position. While pretending to get ready for a cease-fire, India moved an entire division against Khem Karan, on the Indo-Pakistan border, in a frantic bid to regain lost ground. Simultaneously, it launched major offensives in the Wagah, Sialkot and Fazilka sectors. Most of these actions were, however, thwarted as a result of the vigilance of our Army Commanders and the stiff resistance of the Pakistan troops.

Even after the cease-fire, there is no let-up in India's aggressive attitudes and activities. It has been flouting the cease-fire agreement by following a deliberate and systematic plan to seize forcibly as much territory as possible. It has also been endeavouring to improve its position on the actual line of control by creeping forward and occupying areas which it failed repeatedly to capture during the war.

Since 23 September there have been a large number of violations of the cease-fire by Indian forces in Jammu and Kashmir and against Pakistan territory. These have been reported by our military authorities to the United Nations Observers and by our Permanent Representative to the Secretary General. In spite of their endeavours, the United Nations Observers have not been able to ensure effective absorvance of the cease-fire or vacation of territory seized forcibly by India since 23 September. It is no wonder that the Secretary-General is concerned about the deterioration in the situation and mounting tension in various sectors of the battlefront, and that he has come to the conclusion that "the existence of the cease-fire must be considered precarious".

At the meeting of the Security Council held on 27 September, I mentioned some of the breaches of the cease-fire committed by India between 23 and 26 September. I also drew the attention of the Council to the first three reports of the Secretary-General which showed that our complaints were well founded. The Council was naturally concerned over this state of affairs and again called for strict observance of the cease-fire. Let us now see how far India has complied with Council's directives.

There has been no diminution even after 27 September either in the number or in the gravity of breaches of the cease-fire committed by India. Numerous complaints have been filed by our military authorities of which only a small proportion have been investigated so far by United Nations Observers. Their reports, however, leave no doubt as to India's responsibility for proved violations of the cease-fire. I shall not weary the Council with

details of all the cases investigated by the United Nations Observers, but I should like to invite the Council's attention to some of the major breaches of the cease-fire which India has committed during this month and which have been dealt with in the Secretary-General's reports dated 18 and 23 October.

In the Domel-Tanqdhar sector, on 6 October 1965, the Indians launched a major offensive at Jura and Shahkot bridges in the presence of United Nations Observers. This fact is borne out by paragraph 12 of the Secretary-General's report of 18 October from which I quote:

> "Observers stationed at Jura reported that Jura and Shahkot bridges had been shelled and attacked by Indian troops at 1045 hours on 6 October . . . A later report from the Observers received on 13 October indicated that Indian attacks at Jura and Shahkot bridges had continued in the presence of the Observers and that Pakistan troops had returned the fire . . . In view of the heavy mortar firing, the Observers had to withdraw west of Jura."

An Indian operational order captured by Pakistan forces during this fighting revealed that the nineteenth Indian Division stationed in Indian-held Kashmir was ordered to clear the bulge east of the River Kishenganga and to dominate the river line. Three Indian battalions were used to destroy Jura and Shahkot bridges, supported by medium, field and mountain artillery. Helicopters were also used for logistic support. A photostat copy of the skeleton operational order as noted down by the Indian Commanding Officer of the fourth Kumaon Regiment, who took part in this operation, is being distributed for perusal of the members of the Security Council. This Indian operation continued for more than ten days, in total disregard of India's cease-fire commitments and the intervention of United Nations Observers. This premeditated attack has created an extremely dangerous situation, the consequences of which will have to be borne by India and by India alone.

In the Kotli-Naushera sector, on 7 October, Indian troops, supported by artillery, attacked Pakistani positions on the Indian side of the cease-fire line in the Khuiratta-Janghar area. Again this aggression took place in the presence of the United Nations Observers, who confirmed that the Pakistani position mentioned in our complaint had been attacked by the Indian troops at 0140 hours and at 0215 hours during the night of 6-7 October, and that Indian troops again shelled the Pakistani area between 0265 and 0925 on 7 October. They also reported that two of the Pakistani positions had been occupied by Indian troops on the night of 7 October and were taken by Pakistan forces later in the same day.

In the Uri-Poonch sectors, the Indians are building a road linking Poonch town with Uri, thus committing a serious violation of the cease-

fire. The UNMOGIP have been informed of this violation and of the fact that Pakistan forces will have to take action to prevent the construction of the road. Furthermore, as is now well known, on 29 September the Indian local commander issued an ultimatum to Pakistani forces in the Chhamb Sector to vacate areas under Pakistani control, failing which, Indian forces would launch an offensive action. This did not prove to be an empty threat. The Indians did launch a well co-ordinated attack on 1 October in the area between the 81st and 74th Northings. This area has been in the possession of Pakistan forces since before the time of the cease-fire. These facts have been substantiated by the United Nations Observers in the area, as can be seen from paragraph 11 to 21 of the Secretary-General's report dated 7 October.

In Pakistan also the Indians have been re-organizing and regrouping their forces in front of the Lahore, Sialkot and Kasur sectors, contrary to the spirit of a cease-fire ; and they continue to disregard the interventions made by the United Nations Observers as can be seen from paragraph 46 of Document S/6710/Add. 4. This paragraph states:

"On the morning of 13 October, between 0920 and 1000 hours, Indian troops fired with tank and field artillery at Pakistan positions in the Siphon area on both banks of the canal. The Observers observed no reaction from Pakistan artillery, but believed that there was an exchange of small arms fire. At approximately 1005 hours, the firing stopped and the Observers took this opportunity to place their jeep with the United Nations flag in the west bank of the canal in full view of both sides. Nevertheless, firing was resumed by Indian troops with artillery, anti-tank guns and recoilless rifles and lasted nearly one hour.

In the Ferozepore sector, in violation of the cease-fire agreement, India brought the 23rd Infantry Division, equipped through United States military aid, from the North Eastern Frontier of India to Ambala, an Indian military station close to West Pakistan. A few days ago this Division was moved to Ferozepore. All the evidence indicated that India intended to launch an attack on the Khem Karan sector, which has been in the occupation of Pakistan forces since before the time of the cease-fire.

In the Sulaimanke sector, Indian forces on 4 October engaged our posts at Sanderke with heavy guns and small arms, which created an extremely tense situation.

In the Rajasthan sector also, according to the Secretary-General's report dated 23 October, the Chief Officer of UNIPOM considers the area "to be probably the most potentially dangerous sector of the conflict between India and Pakistan".

The responsibility for this dangerous situation rests entirely with India as the Indian forces in the Rajasthan area have made repeated attacks in

pursuance of a deliberate and systematic plan to seize territory which has been under Pakistan control since before the cease-fire came into effect. On the morning of 7 October 1965, Indian forces, in approximately battalion strength, attacked our post at Raichandwala, which has been in our occupation since before the cease-fire. They used mortars and medium machine guns. On 9 October, the Indians attacked Kelnor, an outpost on the Indian side of the border held by Pakistan since before the cease-fire. This breach of the cease-fire has been confirmed by the United Nations Observers, as can be seen from paragraph 70 of document S/6710/Add.4.

On 12 October, the Indians attacked our position at Ghotary. These attacks have been confirmed by United Nations Observers in the area, as can be seen from paragraphs 66 and 67 of document S/6710/Add.4.

On 14 October, the Indians attacked the Pakistani-held village of Nawatala. This is confirmed by paragraph 71 of the Secretary-General's report dated 18 October and by paragraph 8 of his report dated 23 October, which reads:

> "On 15 October also, an Observer in the Chor-Barmer sector who had proceeded to the village of Nawatala reported that the village had been attacked on 14 October by Indian troops and occupied by them the next day. When the Observer told the Indian major that the village previously had been definitely occupied by Pakistan troops, the Indian local commander replied that he had instructions to clear Pakistan infiltrators from Indian territory. The Observer later received the same reply from the Indian battalion and brigade commanders."

This shows India's respect for the cease-fire.

On 15 October, the Indians, after capturing a Pakistani held post at Kelnor, crossed the Indo-Pakistan international boundary near the village of Bhame Jotar, which is well within Pakistan's territory. This constituted not only a serious breach of the cease-fire, but also an act of aggression against Pakistan.

Our Army authorities informed the Chief Officer of UNIPOM on 18 October that Indian forces in the Rajasthan area were being reinforced by one fresh infantry division. These reports were confirmed by United Nations Observers, who informed General MacDonald on 21-22 October that there had been quite a "substantial build-up in the Jaisalmer area".

The threat of Indian aggression is, however, not over. The Indian Chief of Staff has agreed "to stop offensive action and forward movement" only pending consultations with his government. I must make it clear to the Council that if India proceeds with its evil intentions and launches an attack on our positions in Rajasthan, the armed forces of Pakistan will take whatever military action is deemed necessary in this and other sectors

of the war front.

In a futile attempt to justify her aggressive action in the Rajasthan sector, India has been asserting that Pakistan held only the border outpost of Munabao in Rajasthan when the cease-fire came into effect. This Indian lie has been finally nailed by the Secretary-General in his report dated 18 October. I invite the Council's attention to paragraph 68 of that report in which the Secretary-General categorically states that "the above-mentioned positions under attack by Indian troops"—Malesar, Raichand and Ghotary—"are located in the area held by Pakistan forces".

Again, in paragraph 70, he refers to Kelnor, which was attacked by Indian forces, as "a Pakistan-held position near the border on the Indian side". And then, in paragraph 71, while reporting the Indian seizure of Nawatala, it is made clear that this area "had been definitely occupied by Pakistan troops".

Apart from the above serious cease-fire violations in Jammu and Kashmir and along the Indo-Pakistan borders, the Indians have committed inhuman atrocities on the civilian population in parts of Pakistan which are under their occupation. Acts of barbarity being committed by Indian military authorities against Pakistani prisoners of war have been reported to the Secretary-General. Documents captured by the Pakistani forces reveal that the Indians are violating the Geneva Convention on the treatment of prisoners of war. Wounded Pakistani prisoners of war have not been given adequate medical treatment, and some have been killed in the Rajasthan and Fazilka sectors. All such cases have been brought to the notice of UNIPOM in the hope that they would be able to persuade the Indians to abide by the Geneva Convention and to accord humane treatment to the prisoners of war.

The Security Council, in its resolution 211 of 20 September, called for the withdrawal of armed forces subsequent to the coming into effect of the cease-fire. In identical telegraphic messages sent to the Governments of India and Pakistan on the same day, the Secretary-General stated, *inter alia*:

> "I request your plan and schedule for the indicated withdrawal of your troops."

Again, the Secretary-General in his telegram dated 23 September 1965 to the Prime Minister of India and the President of Pakistan said:

> ". . . it is my duty to inform you that I expect to receive from you at a very early date your plan and schedule for the required withdrawal of any of your troops that are now on the wrong side of these lines."

Pakistan's response to the Secretary-General's request was positive and constructive. Our Permanent Representative pointed out to the Secretary-General on 26 September that:

"... no withdrawal can take place until it has been jointly agreed to by representatives of the two Armed Forces and a mutually accepted programme of withdrawal has been prepared."

The Indian reply and subsequent communications to the Secretary-General, on the other hand, were contentious and designed to delay the withdrawal as long as possible and to provide India with excuses to resile from any plan of withdrawal that may be formulated whenever it suited India.

In his message of 13 October to the President of Pakistan and the Prime Minister of India, the Secretary-General expressed his concern over the fact that "the withdrawals . . . foreseen in the Security Council resolutions . . . have not taken place." In this letter, the Secretary-General put forth two possible courses of action. First, that:

"... each party might find it possible to formulate its own plan and schedule of withdrawal and that the respective time schedules might be co-ordinated with the assistance of United Nations Military Observers."

Alternatively, the Secretary-General suggested that:

"... appropriate military representatives of each side be brought together by and with an acceptable representative to be designated by me to meet either in the area or at United Nations Headquarters for the purpose of formulating an agreed withdrawal plan." (*Ibid.*)

Pakistan took a practical approach to the problem and accepted the second alternative suggested by the Secretary-General. It was also recommended that the meetings should be held in the sub-continent rather than at the Headquarters of the United Nations as all the relevant information would be more easily available in the sub-continent, and senior military officials could take part in these meetings.

Let us now look at the Indian reply to the Secretary-General's proposals. The Prime Minister of India in his letter of 18 October 1965 stated that:

"... since a cease-fire has not been effectively established, the stage for a planned schedule of withdrawals over the entire area of conflict has not yet arrived."

This is tantamount to saying that withdrawals cannot take place before the cease-fire becomes effective. The Council has already heard the extent to which India is observing the cease-fire agreement. India's deliberate and continuous violations of the cease-fire might very well be used to block withdrawal of forces. The tactics used by India to thwart demilitarization of Jammu and Kashmir since 1948 are likely to be repeated here again. I am sure that the Council will see through the Indian designs and machinations and will not let India once again flout the will of the United Nations on one false pretext or another.

In his letter to the Permanent Representative of Pakistan dated 22 October, the Secretary-General welcomed our favourable response to his suggestion. He proposed to send Major-General Syseno Sarmento of Brazil, Commander of the United Nations Emergency Force in Gaza and Sinai, to the area at an early date to visit both capitals and to arrange for representatives of India and Pakistan to meet at some mutually agreed place, possibly near the front lines, and to seek agreement on a plan and schedule for the withdrawals by both parties. We have accepted the proposal. India's reply is still awaited.

The record is open for all to observe and to come to the only logical conclusion. India is flagrantly violating the cease-fire and then using the ineffectiveness of the cease-fire to frustrate any plan for withdrawal. Pakistan accepted the cease-fire in good faith and has taken no offensive action since it came into effect. But surely, we cannot be expected to carry out the cease-fire unilaterally and then follow it by a one-sided withdrawal. The Security Council must also bear in mind India's past record when it frustrated all the attempts made by the Military Sub-Committee of the United Nations Commission for India and Pakistan to effect demilitarization in the State of Jammu and Kashmir. India must not be permitted to repeat its past tactics with regard to withdrawal of troops and once again hold up implementation of resolutions of the Security Council. If the Security Council is determined to implement its resolution of 20 September, it should compel India to show respect for the cease-fire and co-operate with the Secretary-General in implementing the withdrawal provisions of the Council's resolutions.

I must remind the Council that a cease-fire and withdrawal of troops are, in the words of the Council resolution of 20 September 1965, only the first essential steps towards a peaceful settlement of the outstanding differences between India and Pakistan with regard to Jammu and Kashmir. The Council must now address itself to this basic problem.

This my President has also pointed out in his communication to the Secretary-General this morning:

"To effect a cease-fire and withdrawal of troops would be dealing only with symptoms, not the disease. Present indications are that, unless the Security Council gets down to dealing with the root cause of the conflict, the present cease-fire may prove to be only a short-lived lull in fighting. The institution of a Security Council Commission such as we have proposed would be evidence of the determination of the Security Council to see the conflict urgently and peacefully resolved, a fact which should result in a lowering of tension in the sub-continent and thereby help to strengthen the expectation that the cease-fire would endure."

The need for prompt action under paragraph 4 of the Council's resolu-

tion of 20 September 1965 has become more urgent than ever on account of the large-scale arrests by India of political leaders in Jammu and Kashmir and the expulsion of thousands of people who opposed Indian rule. It is a fact which many impartial observers have attested to, that almost simultaneously with the cease-fire India let loose a reign of terror in the occupied portion of Jammu and Kashmir.

In a letter addressed to the President of the Security Council on 18 October 1965 the Permanent Representative of Pakistan has drawn attention to the situation which prevails in that unfortunate land. He has quoted from the disptaches sent by correspondents of a number of reputable and well-known newspapers to show the brutality with which the Indian occupation authorities have set upon the people of Jammu and Kashmir. As the Council can visualize, there are stringent restrictions on Press dispatches from Srinagar. Yet stories are beginning to leak out which give us some idea of the extreme measures employed by India to wreak vengeance on the people of Jammu and Kashmir.

[*Interruption : Now follows a debate whether or not the Foreign Minister of Pakistan can dwell upon the internal situation in the State of Jammu and Kashmir. He is finally permitted to continue his speech which he does.*]

What I have to say now goes to the heart of the problem in the sense that it is in conformity with the Security Council resolution of 20 September. The Security Council resolution of 20 September is not divisible. The cease-fire is connected with withdrawals, and withdrawals are connected with the underlying problem that divides India and Pakistan over the State of Jammu and Kashmir. This is an indistinguishable, indissolvable problem. It is a great tragedy that India would not even want the Security Council to hear of the latest developments, to inform the Security Council as to what is the situation in the sub-continent, how the cease-fire is being observed, why it is not being observed, the object with which it is not being observed, why they are not effecting withdrawals, what are their intentions behind not wanting to effect withdrawals, and why they do not want to go to the heart of the problem that has caused bloodshed once in a generation between India and Pakistan.

This is an indication, this is a betrayal, of the state of mind of India in refusing to discuss a problem which has been before the Security Council for the last eighteen years. They call the Jammu and Kashmir state an integral part of India and they say that it is a gross interference in the internal affairs of India to discuss the Jammu and Kashmir dispute.

This is the mind of India ; this is the mentality of India. A dispute which has brought war and bloodshed and misery to the sub-continent twice in eighteen years, which has been before the Security Council for the last

eighteen years, which has engaged the attention of the whole world for the last eighteen years, is regarded by India, unilaterally—like Mr. Ian Smith who regards the question of Southern Rhodesia unilaterally—to be a part of India. The world must be blind, truth must be suppressed, reality must be hidden, so that India, by the sheer weight of its force, and by its military power, is able to defy the Security Council and deny it the right of proceeding with the determination of a dispute which has to be resolved and must be resolved.

I am thankful to those members of the Security Council who have allowed the rule of law, the rules of procedure, not to be subjected to Indian intimidation, because if the Security Council is to arm India with a super-veto, if the great powers are going to move in step with India's obduracy, then there can be no justice in the world, and then we might as well implement what is regarded to be a threat by us, but what we in good conscience believe to be the only honourable course left open to us.

I again thank the members of the Security Council for having correctly and courageoulsy interpreted the rules of procedure and the resolution of 20 September.

As I was saying the Council can visualize, there are stringent restrictions on Press dispatches from Srinagar, yet stories are beginning to leak out which give us some idea of the extreme measures employed by India to wreak vengeance upon the people of Kashmir. A dispatch by the special correspondent of the Paris daily *Le Figaro*, contains the following account of his meeting with some of those who have escaped the Indian terror :

> "An angry young man grabbed my arm and told me the story of his village, Mandi somewhere in the vicinity of Poonch. 'Indians have cut off the brests of our girls and held them up saying 'here is your Pakistan'. Seven members of my family have been taken by the soldiers and butchered'. He went on with tears in his eye. Another man interrupted: 'they locked people in their houses and set fire to them. The whole village has been burnt'.
>
> This morning I visited another refugee camp further up in the north. Here again I had the same accounts from fleeing villagers. One of them, a bearded man, told me how his village had risen against the Indians five or six months ago. 'Twenty men of our village were participating in action against the Indian Army.' What kind of action? Snipping at soldiers—

[*Interruption : At this stage India again tries to interrupt but as a result of the ensuing debate the Indian delegation decides not to return to the Meeting after the recess. Foreign Minister of Pakistan is thus allowed to continue his speech.*]

Snipping at soldiers passing by, blowing up bridges. Eighteen days ago the Indians launched an attack against our village, and after a fight they entered it and burned all the houses, killing everyone in sight. He said he had escaped with his two sons, his daughter and his wife. He did not know where the others were and how many survived."

The correspondent of *Le Figaro*, who has no direct interest in the subcontinent, continues:

"A little girl, aged about twelve, was standing beside a tall man wearing a blue shirt. She was firmly gripping the man's hand. 'We found her wandering alone in the jungle', he hold me. 'She was keeping the cattle, when the Indians came up and burned her village. So she fled alone, without knowing what happened to her brothers and sisters and family.'

The same correspondent of this paper says that the refugees from Indian-occupied Jammu and Kashmir keep asking questions, and he quotes them:

"Why are we treated like that? What have we done? Who has given you the right to behave with us in such manner? Why do you help India? All we want is to be free from India and to go back to our homes and to our honour."

The magazine *Newsweek*, of New York, in its issue of 11 October 1965, reports a tour of camps of refugees from Indian-held Jammu and Kashmir by its correspondent. The journal writes:

"There, reported our correspondent, he heard tale after tale of Indian atrocities against Moslems in Jammu and Kashmir. 'I talked to the people at random and they all told stories of India's butchering Moslem families, burning down villages, raping and torturing villagers."

The *Newsweek* article continues:

"A ten-year-old girl told me she saw her parents shot. One woman, sobbing and hysterical, said her small children were cut into pieces and her husband taken away when Indian troops attacked her village."

The Delhi correspondent of the *Daily Telegraph*, in a dispatch about Indian-occupied Kashmir, said this on 12 October 1965:

"Resentment and hatred are growing against the Indian army in Kashmir as it is burning houses of those persons who are charged with helping and hiding guerrillas."

The facts are so overwhelming in their detail that it is impossible for me to do them justice in this presentation. What has been reported in the Press is inevitably only a fragment of the reality which, were it visualized here would so stir the Council's conscience as to bring immediate condemnation on India. And India, fearing that all the truth would be told, brought about an unusual, an extraordinary, procedural debate in which it had no right to be a party. For the first time in the history of the Security Council, it

brought about a procedural debate to thwart the truth, to suppress the facts, to make reality out of the falsehood of its policies. That is why they are not here tonight—not because of procedural technicalities or legal niceties, but because under the bright lights of the Security Council they do not want to hear the truth, they do not want to know what they are doing to the people of Jammu and Kashmir. They are not prepared to hear of their atrocities; that is why their seats are vacant. They do not have the courage to hear of the atrocities and the barbarism they are perpetrating against the people of Jammu and Kashmir, and that is why you find them absent in unprecedented fashion. It is not because of the procedure, it is not because of legal niceties; it is because in their conscience and in their hearts they know that they are following a barbaric, a nazi-like policy against the people of Jammu and Kashmir.

The harrowing tales which they relate of Indians murdering all the young men and abducting the women are corroborated by the fact that the refugees pouring into Azad Kashmir are by and large old men, old women and children below the age of ten. Young men and women are conspicuous by their absence in the Azad Kashmir refugee camps. The people of Rajauri District, who had declared for freedom after the call to arms by the Revolutionary Council, are being subjected to unheard-of atrocities. The borders of this district and Mendhar area have been almost sealed by the Indians and the entire population is facing the prospect of annihilation at the hands of Indian soldiers.

It must be recalled here that, in the month of August, Indian troops burnt down the town of Mandi and twelve adjoining villages. Three families of Muslims in village Bedar Balnoi were burnt alive in their houses and many Muslims were shot down by Indian soldiers in cold blood in the presence of their families. Several girls were also abducted in the same village. Similar barbarities were committed in other villages in Muzaffarabad, Ravalkot and Mirpur sectors. And because the Indians have no answer, Mr. President, that is why they are not here tonight.

The entire Batamaloo suburb of Srinagar inhabited by Muslims was set on fire and razed to the ground. Many Muslims were burnt alive in this suburb by the Indian Army. This burning was reported by the correspondent of the *Washington Star* in the paper's issue of 1 September 1965:

"During the past three weeks hundreds of Kashmiri houses have been burned to the ground—about 440 in Srinagar alone and scores of others in from fifty to seventy villages scattered throughout the valley.

"Indian officials claim Pakistani infiltrators started the fires. But both extremist and moderate Kashmiris and the victims themselves, interviewed while digging in the smouldering wreckage, claim the Indian army was responsible."

The Indian army was responsible for the destruction and devastation and for setting Kashmiri towns and villages ablaze, for abducting women and children and for tearing the breasts off people. I do not say that as the Foreign Minister of Pakistan; that is what the *Washington Star* says, a United States newspaper, the news paper of a country which is friendly to both India and Pakistan and which would like to see a settlement.

What is the difference between the extermination of the Jews in Europe by Hitler and the extermination of Muslims by Indian bayonets in Asia? Is there any difference? Are we to have a double standard? After twenty years of the ghettos of Poland we are still reminded of the horrors and atrocities committed against the people of Europe by Hitler. Men were dead, men were killed, men were shot, women and children were killed, torture was inflicted. Is torture in Europe different from torture in Asia? Is death in Europe different from death in Asia? If people die in Europe, is it different from people dying in Asia? Are they not human beings in Asia? Do they not feel the same pain? Mr. President, it is for you and your grandiose Council to answer these questions.

This explains why there has been an exodus of about 75,000 Kashmiris so far from Indian-occupied Kashmir. There are extremist fanatical organizations in India, called the RSS and Jan Sangh, and the ruffians and hooligans in their service have been armed by Indian authorities to carry out the heinous design of exterminating those who resist the Indian occupation. If this is falsehood, the Indian Foreign Minister should be here to deny that charge. I say with all the solemnity and with all the sovereignty of 100 million people of Pakistan that that is not a false charge. There is not an iota of exaggeration in this charge. If this is incorrect, the Indian Foreign Minister should be sitting here to deny this charge on behalf of his people. But the Indian representatives have fled. Why have they fled? Is the Indian delegation not capable of answering these charges? The Indians are very good forensics. They are philosophers. We know that they are very capable in using pretty words. Why are they not here? They are not here because they cannot answer the charges of the Government of Pakistan or of the people of Pakistan; they cannot answer the conscience of mankind against the atrocities, barbarous acts and ruthlessness; they have no answer to the tragedy and the upheaval that they have brought about on the subcontinent of Asia, to the trouble that they have created in Asia. They are not here because they have no conscience, they have no integrity, they have no words. They are afraid to account for what they have done to the people of Jammu and Kashmir.

As I have said, more than twenty years have passed since the Nazis executed their programme of exterminating the Jews in Germany. We still read the stories of those horrors and the world tries to salve its conscience

by description and dramatization of those bestial acts. Today, despite the existence of the United Nations, despite the solemn commitment of the Charter, despite the convention against genocide, despite all the talk, with its intervals of ten minutes, about the sacredness of human life, India is perpetrating similar acts in Jammu and Kashmir. Will the world remain unmoved? Will it refuse to stir because the people involved are so distant from the air-conditioned headquarters of the United Nations? Are we all to be so shackled by our inhibitions, so bogged down in expediencies, and so crippled by our calculations of power interests that the blood that is being shed in Jammu and Kashmir, the families that are being torn apart and wiped asunder, the voices that are being throttled, will bring forth no response from us? The ghettos of Poland live as a painful and fearful memory, but the ghettos of Jammu and Kashmir are stinking with human flesh, ripped asunder by a monstrous and habitual aggressor, determined to destroy, like a blood thirsty barbarian, all that stands in his way—the beauty and the life of Kashmir, the living and the dead, the truth and the reality.

Pakistan will not stand by and allow India to carry on these monstrous acts in the state of Jammu and Kashmir, where 5 million people live. If the United Nations remains unmoved and unconcerned, Pakistan will take up the challenge and will be prepared for the ultimate consequence of life or destruction, of extermination or honour.

This attempt by India to take advantage of the cease-fire in order to exterminate the population of certain areas in Jammu and Kashmir is one part of the human reality which is unfolding before us. The other is the resistance movement in the Indian-held area and the barbarous response to it from the Indian Government. Let me now give the Security Council an idea of the situation in Indian-occupied Jammu and Kashmir, particularly in the valley of Kashmir, which has deteriorated rapidly since the cease-fire. This is why the Indian Foreign Minister has absented himself from the deliberations of the Council meeting, although he has come all the way from Delhi. The Indian representatives do not want to hear the truth and the reality of the situation. The Guardian of London stated on 22 October:

> "Day by day come reports from Srinagar—many of them attested by Indian sources—of student demonstrations, riots, police firing, use of tear gas, throwing of grenades, closing of schools and colleges."

Mr. President, you are an academician connected with a University, and here we see that schools and colleges are being closed in order to perpetuate Indian terror. The article continues:

> "The Indian Government, having earlier this month arrested more fiery opposition leaders in Kashmir, yesterday turned its attention to Maulana Masoodi and Mr. Karra who want Kashmiris to use non-violent

means of persauding the Indian Government to consult them about who they want to be ruled by. Now all leaders, disunited about methods as they have been, are united in being prisoners."

The correspondent of the London *Times* stated on 22 October:

"Leaders of all political groups opposed to present Indian policies in Kashmir are behind bars: Sheikh Abdullah"—whose son sits in my delegation—"overtly pro-Pakistani leaders, and now those who have tried for years to steer the Valley away from violence and who have sought some middle way, where, in fact, there was none."

The despatch in *The New York Times* on the same date commented that the arrests had virtually wiped out the leadership of the Kashmiri people. It quoted authoritative sources as saying that "the Government had ample evidence that the men had been maintaining close ties with Pakistani infiltrators". The same despatch added:

"In an interview last week, Mr. Dhar, Kashmir's Home Minister, said the Government had no evidence that Mr. Masoodi and Mr. Karra were guilty of collaboration with the infiltrators."

If one examines the reports of Indian statements regarding the so-called infiltrators which have appeared in the world Press, a pattern emerges which is revealing of the truth about the resistance movement in Jammu and Kashmir. Since this movement encompasses the entire population of Jammu and Kashmir and involves both the Azad and the Indian-occupied territories, it is natural that the Indian Government should get involved in perpetual contradictions when it seeks to establish that all the trouble is the work of agents from Pakistan. At first they said that the guerrillas had no local support. Then they conceded indirectly that they had some local support, because otherwise the battles fought by guerrillas near Srinagar and the alleged existence of ammunition dumps in mosques could not have been explained. Then they began to assert that some of the leaders of the resistance movement were collaborating with the guerrillas but a few were not. Then they said that those other leaders—the few of them—also were in collaboration with the guerrillas.

Now, judging from a report in *The New York Times* of 23 October, they say that these leaders of the people of Kashmir are Pakistani agents themselves. The next logical step would be to condemn the entire Muslim population of Jammu and Kashmir as consisting of Pakistani agents, which would mean condemning 90 per cent of 5 million people. All that would have been ludicrous if its effects were not so deadly. The Indian allegations about infiltration are now seen to be not merely a canard, but the means by which India supplies itself with pretext to crush all vocal opposition to its hated occupation. Let me quote a report filed from Delhi in the *Baltimore Sun* of 11 October. I am quoting American newspapers friendly to

both India and Pakistan. The report says:

"The reports of demonstrations and arrests were the first official confirmation of substantial unrest in Srinagar since the troubled State went into what amounts to a war footing early in August. Mr. Dhar blamed the incidents in the city on the remnant of the Pakistani guerrillas...and their agents among the local population. His remarks constituted the first admission by a Government official"—that is the Home Minister—"that the guerrillas were receiving significant co-operation from the people of Jammu and Kashmir."

If an impartial outsider reads reports of happenings in Indian-occupied Jammu and Kashmir which are published in the world Press, the question will naturally arise in his mind: How deep, how widespread, is the opposition of the people to Indian occupation? He will, of course, remember that the press reports cannot possibly convey the full dimensions of the revolt because of the manifold restrictions, because of censorship, barriers of language, and the difficulty of foreign reporters obtaining access to the humbler folk. All the same, he will come across numerous indications which can be pieced together and from which a coherent picture will emerge. Let me now mention some of these.

On 13 October, *The New York Times* reported that three boys, sixteen years old, were killed by the Indian police in Srinagar.

There is a parallel between what the Indians do in Jammu and Kashmir, and what the Portuguese are doing in Angola and Mozambique, or what Mr. Ian Smith does in Southern Rhodesia. These Southern Rhodesians, and the Indians, and the Portuguese, they want to destroy the spirit of Asia and Africa. The spirit of Asia and Africa cannot be destroyed. Asia and Africa is vibrant; it is youthful; it is enthusiastic; it is full of life. We must achieve our objectives. The age of domination has come to an end. The age of domination has come to an end throughout the world and that is why they cannot face the fact that they are dominating 5 million people.

As I have said, sixteen-year old boys and girls were killed by Indian soldiers and Indian bayonets. Commenting on the slaughter of the innocents, the Home Minister of the Indian-sponsored Government in Srinagar is reported to have said that the firing could not have been avoided because "for a small group of police to move around in the narrow lanes of the old city in the present atmosphere is just to invite trouble". What does this statement mean except that the population of Srinagar is totally hostile to India's army and police and will not hesitate to battle with it wherever it can.

The same newspaper, that is *The New York Times*—very much respected and quoted by the Indian delegation in the General Assembly; *The New York Times* was quoted in the General Assembly by the Indian delegation

as if it were a bible; and I am now quoting this bible—of 13 and 14 October reported that Muslim girls at a college had played a significant role "in a new wave of agitation that has been sweeping" Srinagar. It mentions an eighteen-year girl, who hitherto lived a cloistered life, as having stood on a stage at a public meeting and shouted "Indian . . . go home".

It quotes the girl as saying "We must show how we feel. We Muslims here are tired of Indian rule. We want to be with Pakistan." Of course they want to be with Pakistan. They are part of us; they are our blood; they are our flesh; they are our lives, and they will be a part of us.

Is it conceivable that a movement would absorb the passion and dedication of boys and girls of that age unless it was rooted in the heart and soul of an entire people?

News dispatches about the situation in Indian-occupied Jammu and Kashmir report that shops are closed in Srinagar and there is no traffic in the streets. *The New York Times* of 13 October reported that only armed policemen and army patrols are seen moving in the streets of Srinagar.

The *Financial Times* of London of 8 October said :

> "Only the very prejudiced can deny that mass opinion in Kashmir is now overwhelmingly anti-Indian."

The Foreign Editor of the *Frankfurter Allgemeine,* an eye-witness in Srinagar, reported on 10 October: "At least 30,000 policemen and soldiers have turned Srinagar into a huge army camp."

On 19 October he further reported how street battles developed between the people and Indian police when unarmed demonstrators demanded a plebiscite and an end to Indian brutalities. When he drove through Srinagar he saw crowds of protestors everywhere asking for a plebiscite and shouting curses at Indians.

These developments in Indian-occupied Kashmir reached a climax on 23 October when the Indian puppet regime in Kashmir decided to assume control of Muslim Trusts, mosques and shrines, and post police guards at these places. The same day there were reports of widespread demonstrations in Baramula and Shopian against the desecration of a revered shrine in Chrar Shareef. It can be imagined how deep must be the hostility of the people of Jammu and Kashmir to the regime of the occupying power when the occupation forces find it necessary to deny them free access to their places of worship where it is natural for them to congregate and worship and pray to Allah. The extreme nature of this act can be understood by anyone in East or West who remembers that the act of worship touches the deepest and most intimate part of a people's personal life and no Government will dare encroach upon it unless it is utterly desperate before mass opposition.

The situation in Srinagar and the Valley is brought out in the despatch

published in *The New York Times* of today. It confirms what I have said above and bears out the fact that the news stories are tightly censored. The newspaper's correspondent, reporting from Srinagar yesterday had this to say in today's *New York Times* :

"The Indian Government is seeking to destroy the Kashmir self-determination movement with virtually all the means at its disposal.

"In the last few weeks, the Government's policy has shifted from a selective pruning of the movement's most radical elements to all-out suppression."—of the people of Jammu and Kashmir.

"The large Indian police and army forces in the state have been used liberally to break the back of the movement's organization and to dissuade its members and sympathizers from further activity."

He goes on to say that the gaols in Jammu and Kashmir:

"...are crammed with those who demand a plebiscite to determine Kashmir's future."

The Correspondent continues :

"Last Friday, policemen and soldiers blocked all roads to the Hazaratbal shrine, turning away thousands"—thousands, Mr. President—"of Moslims who tried to go there for their weekly worship.

"Srinagar Moslims said it was the first Friday in 350 years..."

Mr. President, the first Friday in 350 years. Yours is a great country: yours is a great continent, but imagine, the first time in 350 years that a people should be told that they cannot go and worship. They cannot go to their shrine. They cannot go and pay homage to their God. For the first time in 350 years the people should be told this—there must be something very extraordinary that the people should be denied this for the first time. Can you imagine Catholics being told for the first time in centuries that they should not go to the Vatican and worship their God? Can you imagine the Jews being told that they cannot go to Jerusalem to worship their God? But the Muslims of Jammu and Kashmir, for the first time in 350 years, were stopped from going to their most holy shrine because the situation was such that India could not tolerate the five million people of that country going to worship their own God.

"The Government said that it had had to take the unusual action"—they regard it as an unusual action—"to prevent a repetition of the violent demonstrations that took place at the shrine last Monday.

"Action has also been taken to prevent Moslem merchants in Srinagar from showing support for the self-determination movement."

This is in *The New York Times*. The report confirms the tight news censorship imposed by the Indian authorities. It says:

"The Government has also taken steps to prevent news of the unrest and its counter-measures from reaching the outside world."

That is, from reaching you, Mr. President, and from reaching members of the Security Council.

"Several correspondents who tried to transmit articles on the situation from here last week had the articles returned by the cable office marked 'Objectionable'.

"One high-ranking official in the state government said, 'We are not going to let any news out of here which is not favourable to our position'."

This is the secular democracy of India which takes so much pride, and which tells the Western countries that India is the only democracy in Asia. The only secular democracy which butchers its own minorities, which suppresses its own people, which destroys the soul of its own society, which has untouchables and which defies the Security Council. This is the secular democracy of India which is supposed to receive support from other democracies in the West. And this secular democracy of untouchables, where we, as non-Indians are regarded as sub-human, will not allow any news to go out of here which is unfavourable. This is the democracy of India which does not allow any unfavourable news concerning India to get out of Jammu and Kashmir. And they come here and sit and talk with great forensics and with a great deal of eloquence of their democracy. They pontificate and lecture to us as to what is the meaning of democracy. We know the meaning of democracy; you know the meaning of democracy; we all know. But they come here and tell us what is secular Indian democracy, which has a caste system, which has people who are suppressed because they are born different, which has people who are killed and destroyed because they are different from them. Then they come and tell you that they are a democracy and that they must be supported. Yet that same democracy refuses to let news out—leave alone destruction, chaos, slander, burning of villages, raping of women and children. These people do not want news to get out of their secular democracy.

The New York Times report is confirmed by a despatch appearing in the *Observer*, London, of 24 October—the proximity should appeal to you —It says:

"Hazratbal Shrine in Srinagar, from where in December 1963 an uprising in Kashmir sparked off, might once again see the same. For at Hazratbal on Monday, occurred a clash between police and the mob of Kashmiri students which Government spokesmen say might have terrible consequences."

These are Government spokesmen saying that it will have terrible consequences.

The report continues:

"Hazratbal has become a symbol for right to self-determination campaign and a last desperate throw by"—the people of—"Kashmiris.

It is clear that the plebiscite campaign in Srinagar has been taken over completely by students and has become a kind of children's revolt terrifying in its innocent determination."

When there is an almost general strike in a city when all popular leaders of a people are thrown behind bars, when the police dare not move about in small numbers, when the Government is driven to obstruct the people's prayer congregations, when schools and colleges are closed, when the young are in the forefront of the opposition movement, it will be but a heartless soul who does not conclude that this is an extreme situation which cannot possibly be allowed to continue. The people of Jammu and Kashmir, themselves, are unarmed, they are fighting their oppressors with only the weapons which the weak have always used against the strong. The Editor of the *Frankfurter Allegmeine* and the correspondent of *The New York Times* whom I have quoted have both said that people in Srinagar came to them and pleaded, "Please tell our story to the world. Please tell them what you have seen here. You are now our only hope."

It means, Mr. President, please tell the story to you and to the members of your Council because you now are their only hope.

As I read these words, I am driven to ask the question: Are we here so hardened in our hearts, so deadened in our conscience, so morally bankrupt, that we will be deaf to this piteous pleading of a people groaning under the oppressor's heel?

The truth of the reports I have quoted can be verified by a visit to any part of Indian-occupied Jammu and Kashmir by any impartial observer from any country in the world.

In our permanent representative's letter to you, Mr. President, dated 18 October 1965, my Government suggested that the Secretary-General send immediately his personal representative to visit the Indian-occupied part of Jammu and Kashmir and gather a first-hand account of the situation. My Government believes that what is happening in the occupied state of Jammu and Kashmir today should be brought under the scrutiny of the whole world. This is, above all, a human problem and a human question. Irrespective of the measures that the Council may eventually decide to take in order to bring about or facilitate a final settlement of the Jammu and Kashmir dispute, it is the Council's duty to go to the succour of a people whose fate has been the subject of its deliberations for nearly two decades and who are today subjected to untold hardships under its very gaze. The people of Jammu and Kashmir are a part of Pakistan. We cannot and we shall not stand by as silent spectators while India, with seeming impunity, proceeds to wreak vengeance upon them.

I repeat with all the solemnity at my command that the hundred million people of Pakistan will not and shall not allow Indian tyranny and Indian

oppression to be perpetrated against them. We shall face absolute desolation, extinction, but we will not allow these absent war lords to perpetrate horror and crimes against the people of Jammu and Kashmir. It is a part of our duty, it is a part of our faith, it is a part of our religion, it is a part of our tradition, it is a part of our culture, it is a part of our life, that we shall honour our commitments to the people of Jammu and Kashmir. This you must know. And then do not say that we spread trouble or that we are the cause of anguish and anger. We have suffered. Our people have suffered. We have gone through torment and tumult. Young women and children destroyed, killed, lacerated—you cannot lacerate a heart. I speak this evening with a bleeding heart. I come from the battlefields of Pakistan, where we have fought a monstrous and a habitual aggressor—and I tell you, Sir, that we are prepared for the ultimate consequences, but we shall never surrender our honour and our self-respect. The Security Council must know this, the Permanent Members of the United Nations must know this —that Pakistan will face extinction, we shall face decimation, we shall face destruction, but we shall honour our pledge, because we are an honourable people. And this you must know when you pontificate under your great lights.

I would like formally to reiterate the request of my government that a fact-finding committee, or the Secretary-General of the United Nations, should without further delay visit the embattled State of Jammu and Kashmir in order to see for themselves what is happening there, report the facts to the Council, and suggest prompt and effective measures to end this intolerable situation in Jammu and Kashmir.

The situation in Jammu and Kashmir today, with its passion and poignancy, its suffering and tragedy, should serve to restore some perspective to the Council's consideration of the Jammu and Kashmir dispute. It is all very well for people to listen to arguments and counter-arguments on the two sides and say, "Oh, well, it is a very complex question". It is all very well for world powers to go through careful calculations of their interests and opine, "Oh, it is a very delicate problem". But to the people of Jammu and Kashmir, and to the people of Pakistan, the people who are involved in it, whose life and honour are at stake, whose happiness and aspirations are threatened, whose very existence as a people is jeopardized, there is nothing complex or delicate about this problem. What is so complex in an issue of freedom or enslavement? What is so delicate in a choice between security and torture? I have assumed that the members of the Council are aware of numerous reports which all say that the huge demonstrations in Srinagar have just one slogan: "Our demand is plebiscite." This shows that, however, it may look in a debating chamber of the Security Council, the plebiscite is eminently feasible to the people of Jammu and Kashmir. After all, it is

their judgement which is of supreme importance.

Is the Council aware that Jammu and Kashmir is larger in size and population than several Members of the United Nations? Its five million people have never been a part of India. "What they seem to resent simply", a reporter wrote in the *Irish Times* of 11 October, "is their belonging to India being taken for granted by New Delhi." For India to say that there is an issue of national integrity involved here is preposterous because the national integrity of India comprises the territory which was included in the Dominion of India at the time of its establishment as an independent state on 15 August 1947 and those territories which acceded to it without dispute. By no stretch of imagination can Jammu and Kashmir be included in either of these categories.

How, when and where did Jammu and Kashmir become an integral part of India? Not when India came to the Security Council saying that—and I quote from India's communication of 1 January 1948:

> "It was imperative on account of the emergency that the responsibility for the defence of Jammu and Kashmir State should be taken over by a Government capable of discharging it. But, in order to avoid any possible suggestion that India had utilized the State's immediate peril for her own political advantage, the Government of India made it clear that once the soil of the State had been cleared of the invader and normal conditions restored, its people would be free to decide their future by the recognized democratic method of a plebiscite or referendum which, in order to ensure complete impartiality, might be held under international auspices."

These are the words and the commitment of the Government of India.

Jammu and Kashmir did not become part of India when India accepted the UNCIP resolution of 5 January 1949, paragraph 1 of which states:

> "The question of the accession of the State of Jammu and Kashmir to India or Pakistan will be decided through the democratic method of a free and impartial plebiscite."

Jammu and Kashmir did not become an integral part of India when, in later years, the Indian representative assured the Council that India was committed to the UNCIP resolutions and that no decision of a so-called Constituent Assembly in Srinagar would come in the way. Then, how and when did Jammu and Kashmir become an integral part of India? By the decision of the people of Jammu and Kashmir? Certainly not. At no time have these people been consulted. They have been held by the Indian bayonets and by the Indian horror and by the Indian atrocities.

Jammu and Kashmir became a part of India only by the fiat and by the arrogance and by the chauvinism of the Government of India. Is this a position which the Council will accept? Pakistan will certainly not accept

it, even if the Council were to accept it.

Colonialism, in its classical form, is on the wane. Only a small number of powers continue to hold on to their possessions, justifying their action by the fiction that the territories in question form part of the metropolitan nation. This is the position which India has taken in the case of Jammu and Kashmir.

It would be interesting to see how one colonial power, speaking of its colonies in Africa, interpreted the Government of India's position *vis-a-vis* Kashmir. Speaking in the General Assembly on 11 October 1965, the Foreign Minister of Portugal said:

> "We have here two points of the utmost importance: first, foreign countries or outside organizations cannot request that a plebiscite be held in a territory which is part of another nation; and, second, integration of a territory by a constitutional provision or clause is considered to be legitimate and final, and should be so accepted by all."

The Portuguese Foreign Minister, who was defending his Government's policy in Angola and Mozambique, went on to say:

> "Let us see whether the Indian Government from now on will dare to ask for the implementation of other and different criteria when other governments are involved."

India, which herself has only just emerged from ten centuries of foreign domination—for 800 years they were under Pakistan, for 200 years under the British—has joined the dwindling ranks of colonial powers and deals with occupied Jammu and Kashmir as if it were a colonial possession. The atrocities that are being perpetrated on the defenceless people of Jammu and Kashmir are no less cruel than those which the people of other colonial territories have had to suffer. The repressive laws through which India seeks to cow the people of Jammu and Kashmir are no different in their character and effect from those which the Rhodesian minority employs to prevent the people of Southern Rhodesia from exercising their right to self-determination. If the Government of South Africa has sent hundreds of leaders of the South African people to prison without trial, then the Government of India is acting no differently in occupied Jammu and Kashmir.

The General Assembly adopted, only the other day, a resolution on the situation in Southern Rhodesia. The Council will shortly meet in order to consider the South African question. It should come as no surprise to the world that, as the Government of South Africa has done in the case of apartheid, the Government of India now pleads that discussion of Kashmir in the Security Council compromises the internal sovereignty of India by raising matters which are within her domestic jurisdiction. Mr. Shastri speaks the language of Mr. Ian Smith when he asserts that any concern by the United Nations in the fate of the people of Jammu and Kashmir

constitutes interference with India's internal affairs and infringement of India's sovereignty.

The minority clique which today rules Southern Rhodesia, against the will of its people, on the basis of a constitution specially made to perpetuate alien rule, would like nothing better than to be left alone in the possession of the land which they have stolen from the real people of the country. The Government of India constantly complains that there is little sympathy and understanding in the world for its case on Jammu and Kashmir. The Indian leaders should ponder over this fact and try to understand the reason why they can seek support for their policy on Jammu and Kashmir only from the Ian Smiths of the world.

The Security Council gave a pledge to the people of Jammu and Kashmir that they would not be placed under a sovereignty which was imposed on them by an imperial army of occupation. On 20 September 1965 the Council committed its prestige and power to going to the heart of the problem and to securing a just and honourable settlement of the dispute. The question is: should the Council allow either party to veto its efforts? If so, then one must be candid and say that the United Nations, this Organization which we look upon as the custodian of humanity's conscience, is now destitute of courage and drained of all its powers and its moral resources. The long history of the Jammu and Kashmir dispute is sufficient proof of how India's wilfulness has been encouraged by the seeming helplessness of this Council.

Should this process have no end? Is the Council powerful enough to tell Pakistan, "The blood you have shed shall not be in vain", and so powerless as to tell India that it cannot come to a settlement? You cannot approbate and reprobate. Either you are powerful enough to put your force, morality, strength, will and law behind the settlement or else you tell us, "We cannot settle the problem : it is beyond our competence; we cannot do it, unless the Indians agree." In that case, why do you stop us from the ultimate sacrifice? If you have the power to stop us, to bring about a settlement, with all the experience that you have of the dispute, then you should have the strength and courage to fulfil your promise and your pledge and bring about a settlement between the people of India and the people of Pakistan by settling the dispute in Jammu and Kashmir. Why these double standards—one standard applicable to Pakistan and the other applicable to India, because India is big, India is resourceful, India has certain interest? Well, Pakistan is not small either. Pakistan is not without resources either. Pakistan also has a place in Asia. Pakistan is in the forefront of the Asain movement.

If one is to go by the criterion of justice, of what is right, one does not go by the size of Pakistan or the size of India or by what your vital in-

terests in India are or what your vital interests in Pakistan are. Your vital interests are best served by bringing about a just and honourable settlement. Therefore the Security Council is committed by its resolution of 20 September to bring about an honourable and equitable settlement of the Jammu and Kashmir dispute. This it is committed to bring about in the interests of the Security Council, of the United Nations, of the great powers, of world peace and of peace in Asia. Do not tell us, "Pakistan, stop, because we have the power to force you to stop", and tell India "Do not stop, because we do not have the power to stop you." Do not tell "Pakistan, "Accept the solution", and tell India, "Do not accept the solution." Both countries must be treated at par. The two countries have fought against each other. We have established our equality for all time with India, because India, a habitual predatory aggressor, committed aggression against Pakistan, and we repelled that aggression. We established Pakistan because we were on a basis of equality. There is complete equality between the people of India and the people of Pakistan. On the basis of equality, determine the issue on the rights and wrongs, on the morality of the situation and on the basis of international law and international agreements.

It is impossible to think of this dispute without recalling the many instances in history of the small or the weak being pitted against the strong. The betrayal of Ethiopia when it was 'pitted against Italy brought death and dishonour to the League of Nations. How can the consequences for the United Nations of the betrayal of Jammu and Kashmir be much different? The betrayal of Czechoslovakia before Hitler's hordes involved the world in a disastrous war. The calculations of power interests in the case of Jammu and Kashmir may point differently today, but, whilst these are bound to be ephemeral, the moral laws are eternal and inexorable.

We are being counselled patience today. Has not Pakistan shown patience in the past? More than that, have we not demonstrated in full measure our willingness to co-operate in seeking a peaceful and honourable settlement of the Jammu and Kashmir dispute? Even today, after repeated evidence of India's obduracy—even to the point of leaving the Chamber of the Security Council—Pakistan is prepared to go forward in search of a settlement of the dispute through the peaceful methods laid down in the Charter of the United Nations. The Council has called upon both parties to have recourse to these methods, pending the Council's own consideration of the steps needed to bring about a final settlement of the dispute. We have accepted this advice. But what is the response from India?

According to a New Delhi despatch of 3 October published in the *New York Herald Tribune* the very next day, the Prime Minister of India, Mr. Shastri, said that India wanted peace with Pakistan but that this time it

must be on India's terms. Peace with Pakistan on India's terms! We are not interested in peace on any terms. If it were a question of obtaining any kind of peace, there would be no need for the Security Council, there would be no need for the United Nations. Why not have a Hitler's peace? Why not have a Chenghis Khan's peace? You can have peace on the terms of the victor, you can have a dishonourable peace at any time. Why should there have been a San Francisco Conference, at which you, Mr. President, represented Uruguay and put your signature on the Charter? You came there with enthusiasm, with the belief that we were going into a brave new world based on justice and courage. Was that your concept when you went as representative of Uruguay to the San Francisco Conference—that there should be peace on any terms? Peace on any terms is always easy to achieve. Peace on any terms is something that can be achieved without war. It can be achieved on the basis of dishonour, on the basis of surrender. But the United Natons came into being, with its Charter, to achieve not peace on any terms but a just and lasting peace.

Mr. Shastri said : "This time it must be settled on India's terms." It will never be settled on India's terms. That is out of the question. Who is Mr. Shastri to say that peace in the sub-continent will be settled on India's terms? Have we lost ourselves? Are we completely destroyed? We are 100 million people. We cannot allow peace to be settled on India's terms. We who have ruled India for 800 years, we who have dominated India for 800 years and who are responsible for the civilization of India, for all the Delhis and the Taj Mahal's and for all the grandeur and glory of India, are we today in the twentieth century to accept peace on India's terms? One hundred million people to accept peace on India's terms? It is out of the question. It is for you to know that we will never accept peace on India's terms. It is preposterous, it is scandalous, it is a dishonour to us, to accept peace on India's terms when we have always established our equality and our spirit and have stood for an honourable and dignified world. The Muslims of Pakistan cannot accept that. It is out of the question. It is preposterous that this time it must be settled on India's terms. It is out of the question.

Here the Council has a clear indication of India's attitude. "Peace on India's terms" is something which no war-lord in history could possibly have improved upon, I crave the Council's indulgence to contrast this with what I stated earlier, at the plenary meeting of the General Assembly on 28 September:

> "If the United Nations works for a settlement, not on our terms, but in terms of the Charter, in terms of the international agreement accepted by both parties, then Pakistan will not stint its co-operation in the slightest measure."

I stand by those words. That is the issue, without verbiage or embroidery. The Council here witnesses a clear confrontation, not between two Powers, not between two nations, but between two attitudes and policies which directly impinge upon the value and effectiveness of the United Nations. Anyone might prefer to be neutral when it comes to a clash between two national interests; but who can be neutral when it comes to a clash between the attitude of compliance with the Charter and the attitude of defiance? No one can say, "Let us help one party to defy the Charter a little and the other party to obey it a little."

It is impossible to comprehend how it can be within the bounds of human reason to remain neutral between these two attitudes. In fact, neutrality between them is actually an endorsement of the negative and defiant attitude, because it amounts to an acquiescence in it and an encouragement of it. Need I say that such neutrality is an abdication of the functions of the Security Council, that it undermines all the principles of the Charter?

The present situation brings out the stark reality of the issue. Immediately after the cease-fire, when the world was beginning to feel a renewal of hope in the effectiveness of the United Nations, India lost no time in putting us all on notice that such hopes were ill-founded. The Education Minister of India is reported to have said in the Indian Parliament that the Government of India is prepared to have discussions with Pakistan, but only on the clear understanding that Jammu and Kashmir is a closed chapter. If Jammu and Kashmir is a closed chapter, then what is Pakistan supposed to discuss? And what is the problem the Security Council is trying to resolve?

That is the essence of the Jammu and Kashmir dispute. If one looks at it as a collision of national interests and claims, it would be quite understandable that one might not like to take sides. But it is not merely a clash of interests. It is, I repeat, an opposition of two attitudes and philosophies towards the first and foremost purpose of the United Nations, which, under Article 1, paragraph 1 of the Charter, is to bring about by peaceful means, and in conformity with the principles of justice and international law, adjustment or settlement of international disputes which might lead to a breach of the peace.

In regard to India's commitment to a plebiscite in Jammu and Kashmir, I have cited at earlier meetings of this Council scores of pronouncements made by the late Mr. Jawaharlal Nehru, Prime Minister of India. These are on the record of the Security Council, as well as of the General Assembly. But the source of that commitment is not only the Government of India and its architect and first Prime Minister, Mr. Jawaharlal Nehru. It is also the father of the Indian nation, the late Mr. Gandhi, for whom

I had great respect. We who stood for Pakistan nevertheless respected Mr. Gandhi, who was regarded as the great Mahatma, the man of peace. We still have respect for Mr. Gandhi. He was assassinated by the bullet of a bigot—and that bigot was not a Muslim, but a Hindu.

I have never quoted Mr. Gandhi since I have been Foreign Minister of Pakistan. I have quoted Mr. Nehru, who was the son of Mr. Gandhi, the father of India's democracy and secularism, but I have refrained—in spite of the emotions of the Kashmir dispute—from quoting Mr. Gandhi. However, we have reached the high tide; we have reached a crucial stage; and I am compelled to quote even Mr. Gandhi on Kashmir.

And what did Mr. Gandhi—the father of Indian nationalism and of the renaissance in the sub-continent, a man whom all of us respect—have to say? I should like to quote from a biography of Mr. Gandhi written by his private secretary, Mr. Pyarelal :

> "Gandhi was on his way to Kashmir and had detailed talks separately with the Maharajah and his Prime Minister on 1 August in Srinagar. On the 3rd, a deputation of Kashmiris asked Gandhi in Jammu, 'India will be free on 15 August ; what of Kashmir? ". Gandhi replied, "That will depend on the people of Kashmir". They all wanted to know whether Kashmir would join the Union or Pakistan. 'That again,' said Gandhi, 'should be decided by the will of the Kashmiris."

Those were the words of Mahatma Gandhi. He said that it was for the people of Kashmir to decide.

In all the eighteen years in which this dispute has been discussed here we have never quoted Mr. Gandhi. We do not want to make him a controversial figure in this issue. We have quoted what the Prime Minister of India said about the will of the people of Kashmir. The representative of India is absent from this meeting because he does not want to hear what the father of the Indian nation had to say about the future of Jammu and Kashmir. The whole delegation of India is absent from this meeting because they do not have the courage, or the conscience, or the heart or the eyes to face the truth and the stark reality of an indefensible position, a chauvinistic position, the position of an aggressor. That is why, as I have said, I am constrained at this high tide to quote what Mr. Gandhi himself had to say on the future of Jammu and Kashmir—namely that the future of Jammu and Kashmir must be decided, not by the Maharajah of Jammu and Kashmir, by whom the Indian Government sets such great store; not on the basis of the arbitrary will of a Maharajah who was on the run, fleeing his State; but on the basis of the will of the 5 million people of Jammu and Kashmir.

It was to spare the Indian rulers embarrassment that we never before quoted Mr. Gandhi in this context. We do so now because we have

discovered that it is well-nigh impossible to subject India to the kind of embarrassment to which those who are sensitive and have some sense of honour are easily susceptible. But the Prime Minister of India, who claims to be a disciple of Mr. Gandhi, should show some respect for the words of Mahatma Gandhi.

Whether Mr. Shastri does so or not, it is the duty of the Security Council to rise above the interests and demands of the parties to the dispute, to act independently and look at the issue in its human and moral reality. Jammu and Kashmir is not a piece of real estate. Its future is not a problem to be viewed only in the context of the rights and wrongs of India and Pakistan. It cannot be condemned to a kind of Klu Klux Klan administration. A leading collaborator of Mahatma Gandhi, the father of India, a prominent Minister of the late Mr. Nehru's Cabinet, a contestant against Mr. Shastri for the Prime Ministership of India, none other than Mr. Morarji Desai, is reported to have said recently that the South Indian city of Madras would be razed to the ground if the people of the South sought secession from India. That may be his conception of how Indian unity can be strengthened. But Jammu and Kashmir is not "Madras or Bihar or Gujerat"—and those are the words of the late Prime Minister, Mr. Jawaharlal Nehru. Jammu and Kashmir is not a part of India, and therefore cannot be condemned to be a victim of Indian oppression.

To sum up, it is apparent that, as in January 1949, the Government of India has once again agreed to cease hostilities with a perverse mental reservation. In the light of the events of the thirty-two days which have elapsed since the cease-fire formally went into effect, there can be little doubt that the great anxiety manifested at the time by the Indian Government for a cessation of hostilities was not prompted by any desire to eschew the path of force and aggression and to return to the methods of peaceful settlement for resolving its dispute with Pakistan.

Only four days after the cease-fire went into effect, I had the occasion to place before the Council a number of facts which indicated that India was using the cease-fire to re-establish its authority in Indian-occupied Kashmir and to crush the Jammu and Kashmir Liberation Movement. The Council has also been apprised of the various military measures taken by India to improved the tactical position of its forces and to recapture territory lost to Pakistan during the war.

In recent weeks there have been large-scale movements of Indian troops from other parts of India to Jammu and Kashmir and the borders of Pakistan. A mountain division equipped by the United States has been moved from the NEFA area to Ferozepur, and another such division from Ladakh to Tithwal. Augmentation of forces amounts to a grave violation of the cease-fire and gives the lie to India's assurances of peaceful future

behaviour.

Pakistan accepted the Security Council's call for a cease-fire in good faith and stands ready to carry out its obligations without reserve. We stopped fighting in order to avert further bloodshed and the danger of a more widespread conflict in the sub-continent, and perhaps beyond. However, Pakistan cannot be expected to exercise endless restraint in the face of India's patent and proven aggressiveness. Pakistan cannot permit India to continue to nibble away at its positions and to obtain, under the cover of a cease-fire, what it failed to gain on the battlefield—namely, a position of military advantage from which it can dictate terms to Pakistan and force us to abandon our support for the right of the people of Jammu and Kashmir to determine their own future in freedom.

Mr. President and members of the Council, Pakistan complied with your call for a cease-fire in the expectation, on the basis of the solemn assurances given by the Council and, in particular, by the four great powers, that the future of the people of Jammu and Kashmir, who have for eighteen years borne the burden of India's tyrannical and hated occupation, would at last be the subject of a final settlement, based on justice and honour.

Paragraph 4 of the Security Council resolution of 20 September commits the Council to consider steps which it might take to bring about such a settlement of the Jammu and Kashmir dispute. More than a month has gone since the cease-fire went into effect, a cease-fire which the Council regarded as the first step towards a peaceful settlement of the Jammu and Kashmir dispute. The withdrawal of armed forces called for in the resolution of 20 September has not even commenced and, from what I stated a short while ago, it is to be feared that the Government of India will delay as long as possible the withdrawal of its troops, with the object of averting or delaying consideration by the Council of the political problem underlying the Indo-Pakistani conflict.

In the light of experience, there cannot be any doubt that India will not of its own volition do anything to facilitate a peaceful settlement of the dispute over Jammu and Kashmir. The history of the last eighteen years has shown that India will use every argument, and will even run away from the Council, exploit every event and happening in the world to prevent the people of Jammu and Kashmir from exercising their right of self-determination. India will comply only when it realizes that the Council will not tolerate any dilatory tactics and will insist on strict implementation of all parts of its resolution of 20 September 1965.

As I appear before the Council today, it would be unfair to the world community if I did not point out that Pakistan does not come here as a supplicant before this Organization. In signifying our willingness to

stabilize the cease-fire and to withdraw our troops in conformity with the Security Council resolution, in assuring the Council of our readiness to co-operate in the search for a just and honourable settlement, Pakistan is adhering to the self-same path which it has followed all these eighteen years. It is the only path of honour. We believe in the implementation of the resolutions of the Security Council, and in so doing we take the rough with the smooth. We do not flinch from sacrificing a position of advantage if justice so requires. We are fortified by the faith that, despite India's arrogance and obduracy, despite its flouting all canons of civilized conduct, despite the armed might which it deploys against Kashmir's helpless people, this long, drawn-out tragedy can end only in the victory of the people of Jammu and Kashmir and in the vindication of the honourable position which our country and our people have taken.

We are committed to honour our pledges. We shall honour our pledges irrespective of the consequences. It is only when a nation is prepared to stand by its word, by its commitments, by its honour and by its pledges that it can serve its people, that it can serve the cause of peace.

It is not a question here of unequals pitted against each other, with the Security Council trying to bring about certain equilibrium. It is more than that. You have to go back to the very quest of mankind for a just and honourable future, for a right and for a proper society. That is what has brought about revolutions in the world. That is how the French Revolution took place; and when the Kings of Europe threatened France, the revolutionaries of France said : "You threaten us; we give you the head of a King".

And we tell you, Mr. President, we shall face complete extermination; we shall face destruction; we shall never dishonour our pledge. We shall fight by the people of Jammu and Kashmir, and we shall honour that pledge irrespective of what the Security Council does, irrespective of what the great powers do. This is a part of our faith; it is ingrained and enshrined in our very civilization. And we know it—each and every Pakistani knows, men, women and children. That is why we are able to face aggression from a country six times our size. We have fought it heroically, bravely ; and when the history of that is written, it will be enshrined in the annals of mankind.

There is nothing inherently brave about us, but we stand for a righteous cause; that is why we are brave. We fight for justice; that is why we are brave. And finally and ultimately, whatever you do, we must triumph ; we must succeed because justice is with us. And those who have left this Chamber will leave us also. They will run away from Jammu and Kashmir in the same way that they have run away from the Chamber of the Security Council.

PART IV

UNITED NATIONS LAW OF THE SEA CONFERENCE

Address to the First Committee of the United Nations Conference on the Law of the Sea on March 17, 1958

Mr. Chairman,

In the very first speech in the general debate, the distinguished Delegate of Saudi Arabia paid a rich and well merited tribute to your ability, by using one of the exceptions to the Hearsay Rule of the Law of Evidence. If I may be permitted to emulate the renowned jurist from Saudi Arabia, too, would like to draw on the same body of law by urging this Committee to take Judicial Notice of your erudition and eminence. I say this because I most sincerely mean it and not because it is the unwritten law of such conferences to indulge in courteous preliminaries. Nor, indeed, to win your sympathy, for, Sir, my delegation has much too much of faith in your impartiality to sway you away by semantics. Having said this, I pray that my delegation, like that of the United Kingdom, has made a really successful bid for your sympathy.

As a member of the Commonwealth of Nations, Pakistan takes particular pride in your election, and as Asians, we feel elated in seeing an Anglo-Saxon Asian in the Chair. My delegation also welcomes the election of the Vice-Chairman and the Rapporteur. Together you form a most impressive trinity of scholars.

My delegation would also like to voice its admiration and appreciation for the balanced and empirically constructive draft code on the Law of the Sea. It is the product of a great labour. Each member of the Commission is to be applauded for the individual and collective contribution made towards the accomplishment of this learned and coherent maritime code. Special tribute is, however, due to Professor Francois. We all know that without his painstaking effort, without his juristic wisdom and experience, this draft code would not have been as complete as it is. This document

seeks to reflect the realities of the International Community as faithfully as possible. It seeks to strike the cord of compromise by skilfully associating recent trends and developments with the rules of the past, rules that have acquired a character of permanence despite the relentless grind of time and space.

However, my delegation would like to make it abundantly clear that our appreciation of the report does not in any way bind or commit us to the draft articles in their entirety. According to the object of this general debate, my delegation will, at this stage, confine itself, as far as possible, to the enunciation of principle and policy. When a detailed discussion of the articles takes place, my delegation will intervene whenever the discussions so warrant.

This report of the International Law Commission is indeed an all embracing one. It covers all aspects of the law pertaining to the sea. In addition to the vast canvas that has to be covered by this Conference of Plenipotentiaries in so short a period of nine weeks, the General Assembly has, by resolution 1105(XI), called upon us to study the question of free access to the sea of land-locked countries. As it is, the truly germane issues are complicated enough to take up the entire time of this conference. Despite this we have been assigned additional burdens.

It is my delegation's conviction that if we are to achieve some measure of success, we must discipline our deliberations in such a fashion as to tackle only those issues that form the subject matter of the report "*per se*". It is far better and far more constructive to achieve limited and modest results than to dabble in each and every controversial issue without any result.

We have to arrive at solutions to problems that cover the surface of vast oceans and the space beneath and above them, measure the breadth of the sea and examine its freedom, and give attention to the Continental Shelf and the Contiguous Zone. Doctrines and rights relating to Innocent Passage and Hot Pursuit have to be scrutinised. These and a multitude of other crucial aspects of the Law of the Sea have to be considered and, if possible, settled. The verdict of this conference will, without doubt, affect most significantly the conduct of nation-states *vis-a-vis* the sea. Too much is at stake and too many vital interests involved for us to cherish unfettered hope. Nevertheless, hope and faith prompt us to move forward with guarded optimism. We are conscious of the failures of the past but are also poignantly aware of the dictates of this thermo-nuclear age that gives us the ultimatum to either embrace peace with the arms of law, or perish for ever into the graveyard of a world Carthage.

The law on the subject we are called upon to codify is prolific. There is a mass of documentation on it. The International Law Commission has, as a result of its eight years of unremitting labour, collected and correlated

all the Law of the Sea in its draft. The document containing the draft articles greatly facilitates our task but much ground has still to be covered to complete the work.

Codification as used in Municipal Law cannot be applied to International Law in its purest context. Only well recognized and settled rules of law are the subject matter of codification. New laws, laws in their embryonic and formative stage, cannot be codified. Such an attempt would be injurious both to the norm itself and the society it seeks to regulate. New rules must be permitted to mellow and mature before they are tabulated into a code. Whereas old and established rules of law are codified, new laws are enacted by legislative organs of the state. Had we gathered here as legislators of a world parliament we could have formulated new rules of law into a statute. International Law being as decentralized as it is, can only give us the mandate to codify existing law, and that too, if we stretch the meaning of the word codification to a point where it all but snaps. If this proposition is accepted, new rules of International Law, as contemplated in article 13 of the Charter of the United Nations may be recognized but not codified.

During the course of this debate we have heard several eloquent and euphemistic references to the progressive development of International Law. Times have undoubtedly changed. Institutions and values of yore have become effete. Invincible states that controlled the destinies of teeming multitudes are now weak and vulnerable. Those held in bondage are now free, and with that freedom, have changed the path of history. Revolutionary changes, to achieve normalcy, call for revolutionary laws. That the pattern of humanity has undergone a radical change is admitted; only those who are spiritually and culturally barren will deny it. It is also agreed that law must mirror most faithfully the pace of human activity and conduct. However, by its very infinite nature, new law can be created and recognized but not codified until it is fully developed.

Pakistan is deeply concerned with all the Law of the Sea. Each part of this law is so wedded with the other as to form a composite whole. Both wings of Pakistan have fairly large coastlines. Its fisheries are of considerable economic importance, both from the point of view of consumption in the country and of export. Our fisheries industry is developing rapidly and its potential advancement carries a great promise not only for the many citizens directly concerned with this industry but also for the prosperity of the nation as a whole. The wealth of the sea-bed and its subsoil, both of the Territorial Sea and of the Continental Shelf, are being explored by modern technological means. Most important of all, it is the sea that connects East and West Pakistan and through this mighty force of nature we maintain the geographical indivisibility of our state. Perhaps for this reason, the

concept of the Freedom of the High Seas has far greater meaning for us than for many other states, including the great maritime powers.

There are two paramount aspects of the Law of the Sea that must be synthesized. In dialectical terms the thesis is the doctrine of Freedom of the High Seas and the antithesis, the Right of the Coastal State to a Territorial Sea. The clash of these two fundamental rules does not only suggest a clash of norms but also a keen and critical rivalry between International Law and National Law, between the sovereignty of states and that of International Law.

Our primary duty is to reconcile this conflict. Each of these important aspects of the Law of the Sea carries with it a set of rights and obligations. The breadth of the Territorial Sea has an immense bearing on the coastal state, indeed it is within its sovereign domain. This view has remained by and large unchallenged since the time of Bartholus. It is indispensable for the security and socio-economic well-being of the coastal state to exercise sovereign rights over its Territorial Sea. This right, though sovereign, is not absolute. No right is absolute, not even the fundamental rights guaranteed in the constitutions of municipal states. The limitations on this right over territorial waters have been mentioned often enough in this debate and do not require repetition. Similarly, the concept of Freedom of the High Seas permits no one to make the High Seas an arena for anarchy and chaos. The Freedom of the High Seas means that they are open to all nations without discrimination and without let or hindrance.

It is so important a freedom that in 1918 President Woodrow Wilson proclaimed it as the first principle of his fourteen points. Its importance over the years has not diminished. Both President Roosevelt and Prime Minister Mr. Churchill reiterated and re-emphasized this freedom in the Atlantic Charter. Important though this freedom is to all nations, it is not absolute in form or content. For example, ships on the High Seas are subject to the jurisdiction of the flag state, and likewise, piracy and slave trade are subject to international jurisdiction. In recent times some authorities have contended that the Doctrines of the Contiguous Zone and the alleged right to explore without limit the Continental Shelf have made further inroads into this freedom. None can therefore question the truism that neither the sovereign rights of the coastal state over Territorial Waters nor the Freedom of the High Seas are absolute. One can, however, challenge with cogency the degree of legitimate interference with the right over Territorial Waters and with the Freedom of the High Seas.

Numerous interesting arguments have been advanced in favour of and against the three mile rule. The defenders of the classical standard have in the main contended that the three mile limit is the only recognized limit permissible under International Law and that article 3 of the draft code of

the International Law Commission confirms this view. The conclusions drawn from article 3 and the commentary thereon are that as long as certain territorial claims are not based on a generally recognized rule of International Law they cannot be valid *erga omnes*. Article 38(1) b of the Statute of the International Court of Justice is quoted in support of this contention. These are forceful contentions and my delegation has heard and studied them with care.

My delegation has given equal attention to the arguments advanced against the classical rule. Those who claim a ceiling of twelve miles have sought to rest their contention chiefly on the ground that the maximum limit of twelve miles is the recognized norm of International Law as spelt out in article 3 of the draft code. This clearly indicates that article 3 is subject to conflicting interpretation. I would like to mention that my delegation has also taken cognizance of the views of delegations that have chosen to ignore article 3 altogether and demand an extensive territorial limit stretching to hundreds of miles. They claim that they cannot be bound by those rules of law in the formulation of which they played no part. They thus, have an honest approach to the subject. They reject totally the old norm on the ground that rules formulated way back in 1703 cannot remain valid in the fast changing and dynamic conditions of the present. For them, the three mile rule founded on the range of cannon shot is clearly a relic of the past and therefore cannot find any place in the panoply of modern international affairs. They vehemently denounce the classical rule for the following, amongst other, reasons:

(1) That when these rules were formulated, they were under colonial domination and had no voice in their creation.
(2) That for reasons of security the three mile rule must be abandoned.
(3) That economic needs demand, in the interest of conservation, an extension of the Territorial Sea.
(4) That regional needs and circumstances require such action.

These are all extremely attractive arguments. But I would like to say, not by way of a rebuttal, but for the purpose of exploring these arguments, that some authorities hold that when a nation is under colonial domination, the 'WILL' of that nation is expressed through and by the country exercising sovereignty over it. They add that only when the nation in question acquires its independence does it become a member of the inernational community with a distinct and separate personality and that all the rules of International Law existing at the time are binding on it. Should it be opposed to certain rules, it must follow the procedure laid down by International Law for the repeal, amendment, and modification of such rules. It cannot unilaterally repudiate them on the ground that it was not a member of the international community at the time when they were formulated. If such a course of

action were legally permissible, there would be widespread uncertainty in International Law. There is, however, no need to enter into this controversy. At the time of this conference, the states that hold the aforesaid views are free independent sovereign states. Among others, they have been called upon to pronounce the limit on territorial waters. They are now free, wholly free, to pronounce their verdict in favour of Article 3 as interpreted by them.

Much has been made of the argument that the three mile limit is obsolete and that its raison d'être, the artillery range of the cannon shot, has vanished altogether, and that advances of modern science call for much greater breadth of the Territorial Sea for the protection and security of the states concerned. Whether the three mile rule has its origins in the cannon shot range is, from historical considerations, rather uncertain. Reference to a learned article on this subject in the American Journal of International Law for October, 1954, under the title "The historical origin of the three mile limit" will reveal that the real origin of the three mile rule lies in the principle of the marine league.

The range of artillery increased far beyond three miles in the early phases of the 19th century without affecting the principle of the three mile limit. If, for security reasons alone, the three mile limit was fixed within the range of the cannon shot, extensions would have automatically followed in the breadth of the Territorial Sea. But we have seen that while artillery range progressed tremendously, the three mile rule remained unchanged. Furthermore, even when the range of the cannon was well within three miles, and indeed even before that, there were cases in which territorial limits were fixed beyond three miles. For example, in the Middle Ages, the Italian states claimed a Territorial Sea of 100 miles on the basis of Sassoferrato's theory. The three mile rule, therefore, cannot be condemned and discarded on the ground that its utility from the point of view of security has disappeared. Even if there was some vague historical connection between the three mile limit and the artillery range, that connection was lost many many years ago. Hence, it is respectfully submitted that this relationship has been grossly exaggerated. However, if the sole purpose or even the chief purpose of the Territorial Sea is based on the need of defence and security under modern conditions, in this age of intercontinental ballistic missiles, even an extension of 200 miles would be hopelessly inadequate.

Much has also been said on the anachronism of the traditional breadth. I have already stated that we are in full accord with the view that new conditions demand new laws. Albeit, these new rules must, however, stem from recognized norms. In the hierarchy of norms the basically sound and pragmatic norms of Customary International Law form the base of the pyramid. Without this base you cannot have a legal edifice. By all means discard useless and moribund norms but for the sake of progressive

development of International Law do not tamper with old, recognized, and highly beneficial laws on the ground that they are old.

Perhaps it may be useful to recall the words of the representative of the United States of America in the 6th Committee of the 11th session of the General Assembly contained in document A/Conf. 13/19 at page 485, and I quote:

"It is, of course, correct to argue that we should not blindly follow a rule merely because it has persisted for many years. We agree that a law should not be retained just because it is old but neither do we believe that a law must be regarded as obsolete and should be abandoned just because it is ancient. On the contrary, there is a strong presumption that a long-accepted rule of law has valid and sound reasons for persisting throughout the years. The rules of the world are examples of rules of conduct which have an ancient origin but which continue to have validity in modern times. The Ten Commandments are ancient, but that does not mean that they are obsolete. The teachings of the Koran are old, but that does not make them invalid today. I do not, of course, mean to suggest that the 3 mile rule is on the plane with the laws laid down in the Ten Commandments or in the Koran, or that it is of the same character. But I do strongly urge that those who advocate changing a rule that has been upheld through the years have the very heavy burden of demonstrating that the rule has outlived its usefulness and can no longer be upheld."

Far be it from me to compare the immutable laws of God with the transitory laws of man. However, I would maintain that ancient laws are not always redundant merely because they are old. The onus of proving their redundance rests on those who challenge their validity and it is so heavy an onus that it cannot be discharged by mere platitudes.

Extensions in the breadth of the Territorial Sea have also been justified on economical grounds. With respect to conservation of fisheries, the Pakistan delegation intends to express its views on the economic problems in the 3rd Committee. Here I will only say that if conservation of fisheries prompts incursions into the Freedom of the High Seas, that object cannot thus be fulfilled, at least in our part of the World. If extensions are made for the purpose of exclusive exploration and exploitation, then, not only is the aim of conservation defeated but also the desire for exploitation. The High Seas are free to all. Every nation, large and small, old and new, has the right to take the fullest advantage of the resources provided by this freedom. The argument that this freedom is illusory in that only the great maritime powers can take real advantage of it is a defeatist attitude. The life of a nation cannot be measured in terms of decades or generations. Nations that have faith and confidence in their intrinsic strength must have

the vision to think of their interests in terms of centuries. After all, what are fifty years or even a hundred in the histories of countries that hold the legacy of civilizations dating back to Mohen-jo-daro and Pompeii. If the United States of America could subscribe to the doctrine of the Freedom of the High Seas at a time when she was not able to take full advantage of that freedom, at a time when she was too young to compete with the then great maritime powers, why cannot the other young and virile nations do the same? The United States of America accepted this freedom because it had absolute faith in its manifest destiny. We too have or ought to have faith in our greatness and accept this freedom today although we may not be in a position at present to compete with the more advanced states in the maximum utilization of the Freedom of the High Seas. In this spirit, we accept the concept of the freedom of the High Seas.

It has been contended in certain quarters that regional conditions necessitate the extension of territorial limits. Such a course would, however, defeat the principle of uniformity which is of supreme importance to law. One of the cardinal objects of the rule of law is to maintain equality before the law or the equal subjection of all classes to the established law. The rule of law in this sense excludes the idea of exemptions from the duty of obedience to the law which governs the others. Under the rule of law as opposed to arbitrary power, one rule cannot be prescribed for me and another for you. Therefore, it would be a violation of the rule of law if subjective and arbitrary claims were made as exceptions to the recognized law on the ground of regional requirements.

The proponents of the 12 mile limit and those who claim that the law recognizes a minimum limit of 3 and a maximum of 12 and permits the fixation of territorial limits within this margin have to some extent adopted a fair portion of the arguments of those who base their claims on limitless extension of territorial rights. Hence the apparent objections to the submissions put forward by those who stand for unlimited extension hold valid for those who claim the breadth of 12 miles and also for those contending that it ranges between 3 and 12 miles. In addition to the common arguments the proponents of this view hold that Article 3 of the draft code of the International Law Commission recognizes a minimum of 3 and a maximum of 12 miles. As I have said earlier, Article 3 is open to conflicting interpretation. This is indeed regrettable as this is the pivotal article of the whole draft.

According to the rules of interpretation a statute is to be expounded "according to the intent of them that made it". If the words are in themselves precise and unambiguous no more is necessary than to expound those words in their natural and ordinary sense but apparently the debates in this Committee and even the discussions in the 6th Committee of the 11th session of the General Assembly indicate that the draft article under

consideration has caused some difficulty as to its intention. It is not my delegation's object to criticise the draft of so eminent a body. We merely observe that the interpretation given to Article 3 has not been uniform. In this event it is necessary to draw on external and historical facts to convey the true intentions. Among the external facts one may call to aid the records and proceedings of the discussions that preceded the draft. The record of the International Law Commission seems to indicate that in 1955, the 3 mile rule was implicitly recognized as the only binding rule of International Law, as this rule was the only rule the commission held valid *erga omnes*.

There are at least two other rules of interpretation that support this submission:—

1) the rule of avoidance of some absurdity, repugnance, or inconsistence with the rest of the instrument; and
2) the presumption against intending what is inconvenient or unreasonable.

If we interpret Article 3 to mean that it permits a minimum of 3 miles and a maximum of 12, we would be admitting an interpretation that would lead to uncertainty and confusion. It would be repugnant to the very object of law. The prime object of law is to establish certainty and thereby create an orderly regulation of society. If every state is given the licence to fluctuate and oscillate at its whim and fancy between 3 and 12 miles, International Law would abound in uncertainty followed by unmeasurable inconvenience. Such a procedure would be highly detrimental to all concerned. Its obvious repugnancy is clear from the fact that instead of creating stability it would foster chaos. With each periodical change in the limits of Territorial Waters the Law of the Sea would undergo a drastic change. Such alterations would undoubtedly have their serious ramifications in each and every aspect of the Law of the Sea with the result that the entire body of law would be in a state of flux. Frequent changes between 3 and 12 miles would, for instance, affect the Contiguous Zone and the Freedom of the High Seas. So also the fisheries rights. However, even if frequent changes were not permitted or made within this range, it would be nonetheless contrary to the rule of law for it would lead to inequality of opportunity and status before the law. This inconvenience and absurdity must be avoided.

However, in my humble submission, Article 3 does not raise a question of interpretation as it does not propound a legal proposition. It is a bare statement of fact. It restates a factual position and leaves it to this conference to determine the legal position according to the rules of Customary International Law.

Pakistan recognizes the customary rule of International Law to be that of 3 miles. In so doing my delegation does not rest its case on an interpretation of Article 3 or on any other reason advanced hitherto by the supporters

of the 3 mile limit. My delegation does not want to go into the rights or wrongs of the cannon shot rule, or into the historical origins of the 3 mile rule. Nor does it want to base its case on geographical considerations. My delegation adheres to the 3 mile rule for one fundamental reason. We view this issue as a clash between National and International Law. Those who want the maximum limit to the Territorial Sea are in fact trespassing on, and even usurping, the rights of International Law in that they are making serious inroads into the concept of the Freedom of the Seas. Those who want to exercise the minimum breadth of sovereignty over the seas are actually subordinating municipal interests to those of International Law. The High Seas lie in the exclusive jurisdiction of International Law, whereas the Territorial Waters are in the exclusive jurisdiction of National Law. In order to make a genuine contribution to the progressive development of International Law, my delegation holds that the minimum of 3 miles limit ought to be, and is, the only valid limit legally recognizable by the comity of nations. Herein we have shown our *bona fide* intentions to uphold the supremacy of International Law. We invite other delegations to make the same contribution to the progressive development of International Law by recognizing this limit.

We do not believe in the policy of grab. In the past imperial powers grabbed as much land as possible. Now that those lands are free they, more than others, should recognize the innate wickedness of this policy by refraining from grabbing large areas of the ocean to satisfy the appetite for appropriation. We do not believe in the concept of a maritime "Lebensraum". We will hold and take what is legitimately ours and not an inch more of anything, be it land, air, sea, or outer space.

My delegation would like to state quite clearly that we do not recognize unilateral declarations purporting to extend Territorial Waters beyond 3 miles. We can never acquiesce in a measure that strikes International Law so squarely in the face. This should be known to all and particularly to those who are situated in our geographical region. Insofar as the Contiguous Zone is concerned, my delegation is impressed by the proposal that a Contiguous Zone of 12 miles, as recommended by the International Law Commission, be accepted but with the modification that it covers fisheries as well. This proposal is commendable as it endeavours in a most equitable way to enshrine a compromise between conflicting views. It will therefore receive my delegation's most sympathetic consideration.

The distinguished representative of Panama has proposed that a subcommittee of this committee be established to examine the question of Historic Bays. My delegation has also heard the objections of the United Kingdom delegation to it and considers that the objections have merit. This notwithstanding, if the majority of Latin American countries want such a

sub-committee my delegation will make its modest contribution by lending its support to it in the interest of friendship and amity.

A dogmatic approach to the problems affecting the world is repugnant to my delegation. We have come here with an open mind and are anxious to listen and learn. We believe that the last word has not been uttered on this subject and indeed from higher considerations every answer in its turn leads to a new question. Therefore, we are always subject to correction and change if correction and change are really due. God in His infinite wisdom did not arrogate all wisdom to one people or one nation. We can all learn from one another and the more we pool our resources for the common good of mankind, for the progress of the common weal, the more we are likely to benefit. Humanity, irrespective of artificial barriers and unfounded prejudices, is essentially indivisible and the sooner we work with faith and zeal for the greater good of this indivisible human force the better it is not only for humanity as a whole but also for each individual that forms a part of this mighty colossus.

Address to the Plenary Session of the United Nations Conference on the Law of the Sea on March 18, 1958

The philosophy of Islam transcends narrow territorial considerations and strives to achieve a harmonious oneness of humanity. This is an article of faith with us. The solidarity of Pakistan is a manifestation of this noble spirit. Now the people of Egypt and Syria have united themselves in response to this clarion call. Their cultural, spiritual and religious unity overrides the territorial barriers that separate them physically, as they do us. It is my privilege to offer felicitations to the people of the United Arab Republic.

Address to the First Committee of the United Nations Conference on the Law of the Sea on March 25, 1958

It is my privilege to congratulate you, Sir, on your election as Chairman of this Committee. Your fame as a Jurist is so well recognized that it would be sufficient for me to say only that my delegation is sincerely pleased to see the charge of this Committee's deliberations in your able hands. My delegation also welcomes the election of the Vice-Chairman, the distinguished Representative of Bolivia, and the Rapporteur, my good friend Dr. Abdul Hakim Tabibi, the distinguished Chairman of the Afghanistan Delegation. He represents a country that has imperishable historic and religious affinities with my country.

My delegation is grateful to the Secretariat for the informative memorandum prepared by it on the question under discussion. We have also endeavoured to study as much as possible all the other documents relating to this rather complex subject, in particular, the memorandum submitted by the Preliminary Conference of land-locked states and, of course, the scholarly introductory statement made on March 5, 1958 by our distinguished Chairman. This background material has assisted my delegation considerably in the study of a problem that has been approached in a somewhat unusual way. Whereas the other Committees of this Conference have the valuable advantage and benefit of the excellent Draft on the Law of the Sea, as prepared by the International Law Commission, we, on this Committee are denied this indispensable facility. Moreover, the other Committees can take very great advantage of the comments of governments and the discussion in the eleventh session of the General Assembly of the United Nations on the Law of the Sea in arriving at final decisions of paramount importance. Indeed, Sir, all the Law of the Sea, except the subject before

us, has been discussed threadbare. No avenue of research has been left unexplored.

It is not without prudence that the pace of such work is gradual. The ultimate result affects the destinies of all sovereign nations. In so responsible an assignment, one cannot falter. There is value in research, and self-evident wisdom in a patient course. A final instrument that carries the seal of law on so complex and vital a subject cannot be founded on one or two scholarly memoranda. If we accept such a procedure, we would be indictable for a deliberate wrong.

A galaxy of eminent and renowned Jurists forms the body of the International Law Commission. Their contribution to the general development of International Law is beyond doubt. This august organization was formed for the purpose of ensuring scientific clarity in International Law. It would, therefore, be a thousand pities if we were to turn our backs on so valuable a body in the determination of this complex and vital issue. Posterity would accuse us of *mala-fides* if, for once, we were to deny the international community of so beneficial a service.

It would, therefore, be in the fitness of things, and in the established recognition of normal practice if we refer to this eminent body, not only this limited issue of free access to the sea of land-locked countries, but also the broader subject, of the law of transit as a whole.

Experience has demonstrated that the final verdict can only be satisfactorily achieved if issues of such supreme importance are taken up stage by stage. At every stage, some different aspect of the subject unfolds itself and the final decision is reached after every possibility of the unforeseen has been exhausted.

The General Assembly of the United Nations has always discussed with great benefit the International Law Commission's drafts, and the comments of Governments have also, on many occasions, led to revelations.

To plunge into so intricate a field, without the benefit of pre-requisites, is too hazardous an undertaking. The need for forbearance is all the greater and all the more urgent in view of the fact that the land-locked countries have declared, most unambiguously, that there is no immediate practical problem warranting an immediate answer.

Each land-locked country is sufficiently satisfied with the existing bilateral and multilateral treaties. This has been voluntarily reiterated by the representatives of the land-locked countries. Let us, therefore, pause and ponder over all the implications of this branch of International Law before we commission ourselves to restate the law, if, indeed, there is a law on the subject.

Believe me, Sir, my delegation has sought to study this issue as objectively as possible. However, right through the gamut of International Law,

we have not been able to find a right, or a series of rights, as the land-locked countries purport to arrogate to themselves. Precisely because of the scarcity of a really profitable pronouncement on this claim, I am constrained to quote the eminent American Jurist, Charles Hyde, although these very words have already been quoted by another delegation in this Committee:—

> "It may be doubted whether as yet it is generally acknowledged that a State owes a legal duty to another to agree to yield to it on equitable terms privileges of transit by land across the national domain."

Despite the Barcelona Convention of 1921, and the Geneva Convention of 1923, this erudite American Jurist holds the view steadfastly that a state owes no legal duty to another to agree to yield to the privileges of transit by land across its national domain.

It is impossible to make dogmatic assertions on the strength of inferences drawn from certain legal propositions. Very often a legal premise is founded on a condition precedent. In the absence of the pre-existing condition, the legal premise becomes devoid of meaning. I, therefore, urge this Committee to refrain from subjective deductions and to recognize the limitations on law by extension. We cannot submit to a concept of international law that seeks the recognition of law by analogy.

On the one hand, we have the seven principles enunciated by the land-locked countries, which are now styled the basic common denominator of agreement of the land-locked countries, and also the extension of these principles as contained in the introductory statement of our distinguished Chairman (which goes to show the lack of unanimity of the land-locked countries on the basic demand), and, on the other hand, the universally recognized and fundamental principle of national sovereignty, a principle that over-rides and subordinates all other ancillary considerations. However, for reasons already delineated, my delegation will refrain from entering into a premature discussion on these issues.

My delegation is alive to the problems of land-locked countries, and is in sympathy with their geographical disability. This, however, raises another problem. It would follow that any country placed in a geographical disability, whether it be land-locked or not, has the right of transit; and, it is for this reason that it would be advisable for the International Law Commission to study the genesis of this problem, that is the whole scope and content of transit law. Let us not forget, Sir, that there are countries geographically split up, and in such cases, the dictates of justice and equity would grant these states a right of transit by means of a corridor running through the territory of another state, or states. If the land-locked countries insist upon a right of transit to the sea through the territory of coastal states, they must also agree to the same right being conferred on the countries that are geographically split up by the territory of another state, or states.

For, "He who seeks Equity must do Equity".

The relations between land-locked countries and their coastal and transit states are satisfactorily regulated by bilateral and multilateral treaties. The bond of agreement is by far the safest guarantee. Nothing is more loathsome and invidious than for a sovereign state to violate and repudiate its given word, its word of honour, solemnly and sacredly undertaken.

The sanctity of contract voluntarily arrived at and fortified by the recognized maxim of International Law, that of "Pacta Sunt Servanda" is infinitely safer and better than a contentious nebulous right. Hence, it is extremely paradoxical and even tragic for the land-locked countries to think that their interests would be better served by departing from such a favourable position.

Whatever we may say, no matter what the cliches be, there can be no escape from the concept of national sovereignty and all its attendant consequences.

A treaty is an important source of International Law. We could therefore contribute handsomely to the development of International Law by strengthening existing Treaties and by entering into new ones. The distinguished delegate of the United Kingdom said during the course of his brilliant speech in this Committee, that there was a tendency to regard the problem too much from the point of view of a dialogue between the land-locked territories on the one hand, and their coastal neighbours or other transit territories, on the other.

I would say, Sir, with due respect, that the tendency has been in the direction of a monologue. The impression seems to be that this issue is confined to land-locked countries. Such an impression is wholly wrong. All states of the world are concerned, but, most of all, the coastal states. They are the states that are being called upon to sacrifice a part of their sovereignty despite excellent existing arrangements. If the land-locked countries can demand a collective right by announcing a common denominator of agreement, the coastal states and the transit states should, at least, be given the opportunity of also getting together to pronounce their collective views. Every right confers a corresponding obligation. If the land-locked countries have a right in International Law, the coastal and transit states must be given sufficient opportunity to examine their corresponding obligations under International Law.

The coastal states have demonstrated their good faith throughout this debate and even before when the General Assembly Resolution 1105(XI) was adopted. They have not ganged up, or given any evidence of paranoia. Through the mandate of the Resolution 1105(XI), the General Assembly called upon this Conference to *study* the problem of free access to the sea of land-locked countries, as established by International practice or bilateral

treaties.

According to this Resolution, we are quite willing to study this problem in all its detail. There seems to be an obsession on the part of certain delegations to stampede this Conference to the acceptance of certain rules. The formulation of these rules, I repeat, is premature and also *ultra vires* of the Resolution of the General Assembly.

When the recognized and prescribed procedure is faithfully followed and implemented, we will examine the ultimate findings, but within the context of the fundamental rule of International Law, that of national sovereignty of states.

My delegation has deliberately refrained from going into the merits of the seven principles. This is because, if I may say so, Sir, we are aware of the human tendency to talk sometimes too much on subjects one knows too little about.

Address to the First Committee of the United Nations Conference on the Law of the Sea on April 10, 1958

The fate of this Conference is in the balance. A positive contribution will be made to the progressive development of International Law, if it succeeds. If, however, no agreement is reached on the more vital issues, future efforts will inevitably be denominated by a sense of frustration. To borrow an idea from the famous Constitutional Lawyer, Maitland, the Hague Conference we have buried, but judging from some of the statements made in the First Committee, its effects continue to rule us from the grave. If after thirty years the results of that Conference carry indelible marks, how much greater will be the impact of the failure of this Conference of eighty-seven sovereign nations on conferences convened in the foreseeable future.

The United Kingdom, one of the most vociferous protagonists of the three mile territorial breadth, has driven a serious wedge in the legal justification of that recognized breadth by proposing that "the limit of the breadth of the territorial sea shall not extend beyond six miles". Notwithstanding the qualification that "extension to this limit shall not, however, affect existing rights of passage for aircraft and vessels, including warships, outside three miles", the proposal in its totality surrenders the three-mile territorial breadth.

The United Kingdom proposal contained in document A/Conf. 13/C.1/ L. 134 dated 1st April, 1958, is a disappointing document. In terms of historical importance, it ranks in equal significance to Queen Elizabeth I's renunciation of King Edward III's edict that all foreign ships pay him honour as "Sovereign of the Seas".

The Government of the United Kingdom is naturally the best judge of its interests, but an objective analysis of the Canadian proposal would

seem to cover the needs and requirements the United Kingdom proposal seeks to establish. The Chairman of the Canadian Delegation touched on this subject in the course of his speech in this Committee, and my delegation does not deem it necessary to repeat submissions that have been made so convincingly by the Head of the Canadian Delegation.

There is no element of surprise in the Canadian proposal. It was introduced and explained by the delegation of Canada at the eleventh session of the United Nations General Assembly in 1956. I respectfully invite your attention to the U.N. document A/Conf. 13/19, Page 298.

In the two years that have passed since the proposal was made, there has been no indication on the part of Canada to withdraw or alter the proposal. Therefore, it did not come as a surprise to my delegation when the Chairman of the Canadian Delegation re-stated this very proposal with such eloquence and conviction in the First Committee on 17 March, 1958.

Indeed, on the basis of the proposal as suggested by Canada in the General Assembly's eleventh ordinary session, my delegation had the honour to endorse the formula of 'three plus nine' about an hour before the statement of the Honourable George A. Drew, the Chairman of the Canadian Delegation.

My delegation repeats with all the emphasis at its command that we genuinely believe that the acceptance of this proposal is the "sine qua non" of the success of this Conference. It is the only way out of the impasse. My delegation has examined the Canadian proposal dispassionately and the irresistible conclusion of our analysis is that this formula epitomises the spirit of a just and honourable compromise.

My delegation admires the motives that inspired the Canadian delegation to initiate this proposal. That Canada has no vested interest in it is clear from the statement of the Chairman of the Canadian Delegation; on the contrary, Canada will, in many ways, be a sufferer. This, however, is a sign of not only her impartiality but also her greatness.

Prompted by the same urge for equitable re-adjustment and conciliation, the United States of America has agreed to forego substantial fisheries interests by lending its support to the Canadian proposal. This self-neglecting is accepted by the United States of America for the higher principles of the common good of the Community of Nations, in contradistinction to the good of one nation in supersession of all others.

In comparison, Pakistan is a small country. We, however, add our little weight with pride to a cause that is undeniably just. The Law of the Sea will be armed with clarity if this Conference succeeds, and there will be confusion and disillusionment if it fails. In our humble opinion, it can only succeed to some extent if the Canadian proposal on Article 66 is

accepted. In that event, we people from little lands will have the satisfaction of knowing that we lent our modest support to a cause that served the human race, and in that satisfaction we will find the fruition of our own ideals.

Address to the First Committee of the United Nations Conference on the Law of the Sea on April 19, 1958

As a result of your appeal for brevity, Mr. Chairman, I shortened my speech by a page. But when the distinguished representative of Burma voiced the same suggestion to our Committee in a rather forceful tone, I tore up two more pages, in fear that if his orders went unheeded, he may occupy the Islands he threatened to take possession of when we discussed Article 10 of the Draft Code on 17 April, 1958.

My delegation has given serious attention to the many crucial developments that have taken place in such rapid succession in the last few days. Pakistan supported warmly the original Canadian proposal of a territorial breadth of three miles with a contiguous zone of twelve miles with absolute control over fisheries.

This we did because we sincerely believed that the proposal had the intrinsic merit of a workable compromise; and we were convinced that without a compromise, without the spirit of give and take, this Conference could not succeed.

Indeed, Sir, from the point of view of our national interests, we were far from happy over the three plus nine formula as introduced by Canada in Document L/77. Its acceptance without any reservations in the fisheries zone would have caused my country considerable economic detriment. It would have deprived our nationals of the right to fish in waters they have been fishing in from time immemorial. Needless to stress, Mr. Chairman, such a colossal deprivation in the field of economic activity is all the more grave for a relatively under-developed country like mine.

However, Pakistan was prepared to make important concessions chiefly because the original Canadian proposal retained the territorial breadth

of three nautical miles. We firmly believed that in order to preserve this limit, it was necessary, and even desirable, to make truly substantial and tangible concessions.

In pursuance of this pragmatic assessment of the situation, we were willing to agree to an exclusive fisheries zone of twelve miles, provided, and I stress this word, provided, the territorial breadth of three miles remained unaffected.

The position at present is entirely different. Canada had, till 17th April, co-sponsored a revised proposal jointly with India and Mexico wherein the three-mile territorial breadth had been replaced by a six-mile territorial sea.

On the following day, we witnessed remarkable tergiversations. The Indian and Mexican delegations reverted to their initial proposal which they have described as the flexible twelve mile limit; and Canada submitted yet another revised proposal that advocates instead of three a six-mile territorial breadth.

As a result of this fundamental change, that is, the change from three to six miles of territorial sea, my delegation has been compelled to re-examine and re-state its position "de novo".

The three-mile territorial breadth was, and still is, very dear to us, despite all the melo-dramatic and scathing attacks made on it. The reason for our attachment to this limit is patently clear. In my speech in the General Debate in this Committee on 17 March 1958, I said:

> "Most important of all, it is the sea that connects East and West Pakistan and through this mighty force of Nature we maintain the geographical indivisibility of our state. Perhaps for this reason, the concept of the Freedom of the High Seas has far greater meaning and significance for us than for many other states, including the great maritime powers".

The maximum freedom of the High Seas and the minimum breadth of the territorial sea is vital to a country like Pakistan, which is geographically split in two halves and which must depend almost entirely on the High Seas to provide the main link and means of communication between east and west wings of Pakistan.

If the three-mile limit is to be forsaken, we are obliged to consider the next important factor in the priority list of this complex issue, that of fisheries. For this reason, my delegation will have to dis-associate itself from the revised Canadian proposal and support the United States proposal contained in Document L/159/R, which carries certain important reservations in respect of fishing rights in the contiguous zone, reservations that coincide with the essential interests of my country, and with the larger interests of mankind in general.

Animated by the relentless quest for a compromise my delegation has endorsed the United States proposal although even this proposal abandon the three-mile limit. If, however, a compromise cannot be reached on the basis of this proposal, my delegation will have to reserve its right of further action in the Plenary in the light of subsequent developments. And who knows, Ladies and Gentlemen, like Lazarous, the three-mile limit may reserate itself from the dead.

In conclusion, Mr. Chairman, I would like to state that no one can really give any serious thought to the charge that votes, on this very important issue, will be cast on the basis of bloc and group alignments. Every nation has its peculiar geographical and socio-economic interest and each decision will have to be dictated by indigenous considerations. This unfounded charge is all the more painful as only recently, my delegation, in deference to the wishes of our friends and neighbours, supported their views on Article 17 of the Draft Code. Sir, whenever the basic and legitimate interests of Asian and African countries are involved, Pakistan is always in the forefront of their cause, and that is how it should be. All we ask in return, is to at least understand and sympathise with the basic problems and interests of my country. Mr. Chairman, "They have said, what say they, let them say". No harm can be done by wild accusations, as long as truth ultimately triumphs and reason holds sway over the minds of men.

PART V

NATIONAL ASSEMBLY
OF
PAKISTAN

Speech in the National Assembly on June 21, 1962

Age of Rising Expectations—Tussle between the Haves and Have-nots—System of Free Enterprize with Government Regulation.

By way of introductory remarks I would like to make a few observations. Sir, the urge and the desire to be independent is actually linked, in a large measure, with the desire for economic progress. This age has been called the age of rising expectations. People everywhere in the world expect a better living standard and the basic amenities of life. They expect a good life on this earth; and if today there is bipolarization of the world it is not between communist countries and non-communist countries but between the developed countries and under-developed countries; for, even in the Communist Orbit there are countries which are much more developed than some countries in the sphere of influence of the Free World. So, actually the tussle today is between the haves and have-nots. It is the duty of every intelligent, responsible and sensible Government to meet the high challenge of the present times to give their people a better life on earth. It is not the law of God, Sir, that we in Asia must live in squalor, in misery, and in want. It is therefore our duty to work for the amelioration of poverty, squalor and want from our land, and it is with this object that every government strives to fulfil its objectives.

Now, Sir, a government can be either democratic or totalitarian. If it is to be democratic, then the system of free enterprize must form a part of it. If in a democracy it is considered essential to have fundamental rights, if it is considered that certain guiding principles in the Legislature should be set for the freedom of speech, freedom of association etc., then in that case it is also essential to expect a citizen to pursue his professions of choice,

to mobilize his ingenuity, and to collect his wealth and derive the maximum benefit from it. If, on the other hand, this system is rejected and one chooses to live in a properly-controlled, regimented system without any compromises, then targets are fixed from year to year, even from day to day, and all the human resources are mobilized for the achievement of those targets. In such a system, the freedom to acquire wealth and other rights such as the freedom of speech, freedom of association, and all the other cherished attributes of democracy must be forsaken. If it has been the urge of the people of Pakistan to live a democratic way of life based on certain social principles according to history and religion, then this aspect of the problem must be borne in mind and you cannot approbate and reprobate at the same time. Therefore, if we are to have democracy, we have to accept free enterprize. By free enterprize I do not mean a jungle of lawlessness where only the rich can grab whatever they want, because that form of free enterprize no longer exists. It is obsolete even in those countries wich came to be, so to speak, the creators of the system. In the United States of America, in Great Britain, in the Scandinavian countries, you know the amount of Government regulation that controls the ambit of free enterprize to curtail monopolies and other abuses. So nobody wants absolute free enterprize in the sense that some can grab everything. There must be legitimate restriction on such a liberty within a social order.

Motivated by these ends, the revolutionary government introduced land reforms in Pakistan. I know, Sir, as a member of the landed gentry from the former Sind, the sacrifices we had to entail. But the sacrifices were well made and they should have been made much earlier. Today it is a matter of history. Although much was said about land reforms, the reforms were not effected in the period before the revolutionary government came into power. Service of the common man became the principle, the objective of the revolutionary government headed by the President of Pakistan. You can rest assured that the interest of the common man will continue to be of paramount importance to him and to his present government.

Speech in the National Assembly on July 10, 1962

Political Parties Act 1962—Role of Political Parties—Collapse of Democracy—PRODA—Protection of Democracy—Essential for Development—EBDO Philosophy—Elections

Sir, I rise to take part in this debate with a sense of humility because, Sir, as a God fearing Muslim I know the consequences of victimisation. It is in a sense of humility with a sense of fear in the mercy and wisdom of the Almighty that I move to take part in this debate of far reaching consequences.

On the determination of this problem lies not only the outcome of the role of political parties in the country, but the future of 95 million people of Pakistan who have in the last fifteen years gone through a period of crises, who have gone through the buffet of circumstances and have known what it is to suffer under weak and corrupt governments. The role of political parties is essential to every State whether it is democratic or dictatorial. We know that even in dictatorships—in Fascist and Communist dictatorships—the party is a supreme organ of the State. In the Communist States, in the Soviet Union, the party leadership, the party organization and the control of the party caucus determines the government. The party in the Soviet Union is superior not only to the other organs of the state but to the Army and all other institutions in the country. So, it is not only in a democracy but every system that the party is a life-blood of the state. The other day when we were discussing Kashmir, Mr. Chatta made a cogent observation. He said, "You cannot channelise, and generate the atmosphere, the loyalties and the emotions of the people without a party organization." There is undoubtedly a gap in political life without an active well-organized disciplined party system. It is in acquiescence of the realities of the situation that the Government has sponsored this Bill. There is no argument, there is no logic superior to the compulsion of events and the compulsion of events have necessitated the introduction of this Bill. It has been said that the

Government has introduced this Bill out of some ulterior motive; that the Government is trying to stampede the passage of this Bill and various other sweeping and unfounded charges have been made against the Government which, I think, is most regrettable. On the contrary, there should have been universal appreciation of the fact that this Government is conscious of public feelings on important, reasonable, legitimate and sensible issues, that this Government is willing to accommodate the opposition's point of view, after its past prejudices, if there were any against party politics. If democracy is to flourish, you must have respect for the other man's point of view. But when respect for the other man's point of view is shown, instead of appreciation, resentment and anger is being shown.

Sir, why was Pakistan created? Why did millions of people give their lives for the creation of our State ? There are some here including yourself who have been stalwarts in the Pakistan movement, who have fought, who have suffered, who have known miseries and the privations and the sacrifices which all went together and were necessary for the creation of this State of ours. Some of us were not privileged in those days to take part in the freedom movement for the simple reason that we were in our schools and universities but even in our schools and universities, we felt a great and glorious urge for our promised homeland were keen to see it carved out as a separate State from the sub-continent of India. We prayed for it so that we could call it our own, where we could practise our own way of life, where we could proudly live as a separate community, basing our social, economic and political edifice on the principles and precepts of our religion. The fountain-life or the fountain head of our way of life was to be a democratic way of life. But unfortunately soon after the creation of Pakistan, we lost our great and beloved leader, the Quaid-i-Azam, and soon after his death we lost the Quaid-i-Millat. Thereafter, Sir, the political history of this country went through such an unusual turmoil that in October, 1958, the Revolution had to come to try and put the state of affairs in order. We have been told that democracy was not given a chance to survive in this country; democracy was not given a chance to take roots in Pakistan: But may I ask who was responsible for the collapse of democracy? Is the present government responsible for it or are the misdeeds of the past responsible for the death of democracy? If now, at last, democracy is to survive in the country which it must, then it is absolutely essential that those who had contempt for democracy, those who played havoc and ran amuck with the destinies of the people, should be debarred from polluting the social and economic life of the nation. This is a simple proposition: once beaten twice shy, but we have been beaten twice; we have been beaten again and again for the last fifteen years. We have faced one crisis after another. It has been due to the resilience and the courage and the fortitude of our people that we

have managed to survive these crises. We have been told that this Constitution is defective but at least a Constitution has been given to the country. Now, Sir, you will find that for four years we were not able to produce a Constitution at all. In four years we produced one page called the Objectives Resolution. That is all that was achieved in that period when democracy was supposed to have existed in the country. Then, Sir, we have been advised to take all issues to the people because the people are the ultimate arbiters of all issues. This is quite correct but let us ask ourselves: how many issues did we take to the people of Pakistan when there was democracy in the country? Did we take the parity issue to the people or was the parity formula arrived at in the palaces of the politicians? Did we take the general and separate electorate issue to the people? Did we take any single issue to the people? Those great champions of democracy who now talk about full and complete restoration of democratic life should know better. No, Sir, they did not take one single issue to the people. On the contrary they had been denying general elections to the people of this country. The elections they did hold were so farcical that it would be an insult to even a villager to call them elections. How were the provincial elections held? But let me not speak about the provincial elections because they are more important. Let me ask how were the local bodies elections held? Were not the ballot papers tampered with? Have we forgotten how the whole machinery of the police and the bureaucracy were brought into full gear and operation to stiffle freedom of thought, freedom of expression and the freedom of participation in elections? To practise dictatorship in a democracy is the worst form of evil against society, and that is exactly how we were functioning before the present Constitution. Though there was democracy in name yet the most brutal, ruthless and selfish form of dictatorship of a coterie ran the country. The people's rights were butchered and lacerated in the name of democracy. Sir, we are all conditioned by our environments. Pakistan is a big State. The problems of East Pakistan are somewhat different from the problems of West Pakistan. But even in West Pakistan, Sir, problems differ. Of course, there are common factors, but this notwithstanding, each area, each region has its own peculiar problems. By and large there is great deal in common in our lives and in our values but there are differences also. Let us recall how we in our regions have suffered in the name of democracy, the democracy of dictators. My former province of Sind was separated from Bombay Presidency in 1937. Sind, Sir, was not a poor province as I have said before in this House. Its lands are rich, it is a surplus province. At the time of integration of West Pakistan, the province of Sind surrendered 30 crores of rupees to the unified province. So, the province of Sind is not poor, its resources and wealth is not inadequate but still the people are amongst the poorest in the world. This is a

great tragedy, Sir. In a country where there are no resources, where there is no ability to mobilize wealth, the people can be poor but where there are plenty of natural resources, where there is agricultural abundance the people should not be poor—Sind is rich but the Sindhis are poor. This is the anomaly and the grief of the situation. In 1937, as I said, Sir, this Province was separated from Bombay Presidency. We immediately had a few Cabinet crises, but it was felt that by the passage of time things would settle. Things did settle, Sir, in the sense that in those days there was no EBDO, there was no PRODA. So we could not resort to such uncivilized laws. Instead a Chief Minister who came in the way had to be murdered as there was no other way of getting rid of him. If there had been PRODA and EBDO perhaps he may have lived. But a very talented Chief Minister of the province had to be murdered instead as there were no laws as EBDO. The record of Sessions Court is available for all to read and to judge and adduce the motives and forces behind that murder. I would not like to dilate on it. Thereafter, Sir, we suffered and continued to suffer from the petty mindedness or feudal rivalry in our province. I too am a part of that society. Perhaps one reason why I am here today as a Minister is because I belong to this privileged class. Therefore, I do admit the advantages of the system. But, Sir, in spite of the advantages that some of us have derived from the system, in spite of the fact that some of us would fight to see it remain, it has many inherent drawbacks. It leads to petty intrigues, it leads to victimization of the people, it leads to callousness towards poverty and it leads to lethargy. So when feudal rivals clashed with each other the people remained exactly where they were. There was no development, no factories, no roads, no communication, absolute darkness and miserable poverty prevailed. Only the great ones, the chosen few prospered. What issues were such arrogant lords going to take to their chattel—the downtrodden people? But now we talk about taking issues to the people. Then, Sir, Pakistan was established. Soon after the coming into being of Pakistan, the Quaid-i-Azam initiated the disqualification philosophy. We have not introduced it, we inherited it from the founder of our State. The Quaid-i-Azam had no rivals or did the Quaid-i-Azam fear some politicians and for that reason disqualified them. No, Sir, the Quaid had no rival, no equal. He introduced this measure because he knew our conditions and our problems. He knew that on account of our backwardness, on account of unscrupulous practices, on account of political immaturity it was possible for people to play havoc with the sentiments of our masses. He knew that through intrigue, and vandalistic exploitation, a coterie of people could capture power and victimize people. Therefore, out of sheer necessity he ordered the removal of undesirable elements from the political life of the country. Sir, I was referring to the political

condition of my region, and it was the Quaid-i-Azam who dismissed a Chief Minister of my province and instituted proceedings against him.

The dismissal order was passed at the time of Quaid-i-Azam. Later, during the time of Quaid-i-Millat PRODA was introduced for the same good reasons. No motive could be attributed as PRODA was enforced by a personality of the stature of the Quaid-i-Millat. Why and how PRODA was repealed is also well-known, Sir, and the motives and the sinister reasons behind those repeals are an open book known to all the citizens of this country. In 1958, Sir, when the Revolution came, any measure could have been taken by the Revolutionary Government not only to enforce EBDO but even to take harsher and stronger measures. Although there was nobody to question the revolutionary authority yet only a disqualification of six years was imposed on certain politicians from taking part in the political life of the country. Now, Sir, on the one hand we are told that it is evil and wrong to take repressive measures, on the other hand, we are told that democracy must be protected under all and any circumstances. If democracy is to be protected it is absolutely essential that those responsible for the failure of democracy must not be permitted to contaminate the national life of the country for a period of time, until democracy is unshakably established in the land. This is a factual matter. It is much more sagacious to be on the safe side because nobody is indispensable. If those who have been responsible for the deluge, for the miseries of our people are kept out, the progress of society and the march of time will not come to a halt. How can there be a reversal of progress? On the contrary, Sir, it is absolutely necessary to allow new leadership to develop and I would, in particular, appeal to the younger generation in this House and tell them that as elected representatives of the people they must save our people from destruction. It is our duty and responsibility to protect their rights and not to allow the same mockery of justice, the same distortion of principles to prevail again. This is the duty we owe to the people of Pakistan. We cannot go back to them and say that this is a personal matter and out of pity and charity we forgave them. It is not such a simple thing. You cannot decide such an issue on a personal basis. It involves the future of the whole Nation. It is no use appealing to the magnanimity of the President and to his sense of pity. It would be a dereliction of duty on the part of this Government if we do not take a lesson from the past. We have no option. It is absolutely essential that this country is saved from another emergency. Let democracy take its roots so that after a period of time nobody could threaten it. It is necessary for the system to take roots. So, I would, in particular, appeal to the younger generation in this House and outside to fulfil the sacred and bounden duty we owe to Pakistan by serving it properly and courageously. I repeat nobody is indispensable. Men of destiny like the Quaid-i-Azam,

Kamal Ata Turk, or Lenin adorn the horizon of political life once in an epoch. The ordinary political individuals who were responsible for ruining democracy cannot be put in the same class. In that event it is essential to prevent them from getting another opportunity to run amuck with our people's destiny.

We have been told that these people were not given a fair trial, that the code of procedure was a travesty of justice. I have said earlier that when a revolution takes place in a country, then there is no law superior to the law of revolution. Instead of EBDO proceedings, instead of trial, whatever its form, other measures could have been adopted. Believe me there were some people who did want other measures to be adopted. If their advice had been accepted there would have been no room for the present controversy. Such measures have been adopted in other countries, in the recent past. Once, Sir, Stalin was told by George Bernard Shaw that in Europe people were saying that Stalin's hands were full of blood, and he replied, "I am full of blood up to my elbow." "When you have a revolution", he said, "it is necessary to be full of blood upto your elbow." The success of a revolution lies to the extent to which it can break away from the past. Yesterday, a friend of mine said that thought and action cannot be controlled like the Rawal Dam. Surely they should not be controlled; thoughts and action should never be controlled but there are societies in which efforts have been made and rather successfully not only to control thought and action but to wipe out mass of people altogether. God forbid that such a thing should happen in Pakistan, it should never happen in Pakistan, but if we are to save Pakistan from such atrocities, if we are to save this country from such bloodshed, then, Sir, it is necessary to be cautious; it is necessary to be prudent, it is necessary to learn from our mistakes. If we do not learn from our mistakes, nobody can save us. Our leadership will be found defective if we do not learn from the mistakes of the past. Sir, I have said from the very beginning that I rise with a sense of humility. Some of the politicians have been more of high calibre. I have every regard for them and they are my personal friends. I genuinely feel sorry that some of them have been disqualified. But it is not, Sir, a question of individuals, it is not a question of removing a disqualification from one or two of them. It is, Sir, a question of fundamental principle not an academic issue on who has been Ebdoed or who should have been Ebdoed. This is no longer relevant. Apart from the good ones, the exceptions, the general class has been properly dealt with because among them are also those who shook the very foundations of the State, who on occasions would go all over the country, to every part, East and West Pakistan, and champion a particular cause. It was said that the foreign policy of Pakistan was bankrupt; that we must walk out of the alliances of CENTO & SEATO but the next day on

getting into office, there were dazzling somer saults and it was solemnly said that without CENTO & SEATO, Pakistan would not survive. These are some of the people who have played havoc not only with our internal life but have made us feel ashamed in the world outside, in our external dealings. Sir, then there are others who went about saying that one unit should be established, because they wanted to become Ministers. When they were sacked, they said "One unit must be destroyed." Where is the end, Sir? Where are the principles? Is this how policies settled? Are we not going to belie this cult of personality. How can we respect issues if we base everything on the cult of personality. We are Muslims. Islam is a religion in which we break idols; but Sir, Muslims have become idol worshippers. As long as a leader is active in the national political life, he is criticised. The moment he is out of it, he is idolised. But, Sir, we cannot be forgiven by the future generations, if we fail today. So, please ponder and think about this matter rather seriously. What is the problem involved? The problem involved is the survival of democracy. It is necessary that those who were collectively responsible for the destruction of democracy should be debarred from the body politics of Pakistan, otherwise the democracy restored will be endangered. It is as simple a proposition as that. And it is from that point of view only to approach the problem. We know that our people are carried away by emotions, we know that our people can be subjected to all forms of exploitation. It is, therefore, necessary to protect them, to assist them, in reaching clean, healthy, sound and moral politics. It has been said that let us start afresh from the 8th of June. Yes, come on, let us start afresh from the 8th of June. But is this the way to start afresh? No, this is the way to go back, this is part and parcel of the return-road. This is not the way to start afresh. If you want to start afresh, come on, let us develop a new society, together we must work for it, let us wipe out poverty from our land, let us serve our people together. Why must we go back into the rancour and bitterness of past politics and past politicians? It is in this spirit that the Government has introduced this Bill. No personal motive is involved, and no such motive can ever be involved.

Sir, I would like to summarize the position. First of all, it has been said that democracy is our creed, that without democracy Pakistan cannot progress. We agree, and we say that, if democracy is to progress, if democracy is to take roots in the country, it is vital that people who were collectively responsible for the crisis of democracy be debarred for a period of time from coming into the national life to threaten the foundation of this new-born democracy.

Secondly, Sir, it is necessary to take all issues to the people. We must take each and every issue to the people. The people's will is paramount. There is nothing superior to the people's will; but we also know that

through organizations, through various dubious and devious methods, people's wills have been suffocated, and people's wills have been stifled. By a process of democracy a coterie of dictatorship has been imposed time and again. Therefore, Sir, people's will must prevail; but, at the same time, one must protect and safeguard, through institutions, through democratic measures, the indirect and back door method of stifling the people's will. In a democracy people who are against democracy, people who believe in a totalitarian system, by using democratic methods, they impose a dictatorship. Mr. Farid Ahmad mentioned the other day the example of Fascist Germany, and stated how through democratic processes a dictatorship was imposed in Germany. We also know in other countries as well how by the very process of democracy a dictatorship can be imposed. So we cannot misuse the process of democracy and permit a dictatorship to be established by democracy. That has happened before in other countries, it has happened in this country, and it must not be permitted to happen again.

Thirdly, Sir, it has been said by Mr. A. M. Khan that the main and urgent need of this country is development. It is known that our people have one of the lowest *per capita* incomes in the world. If we have to develop, if we are to have a better life on earth, if our people have to have schools and hospitals and institutions and industry, if they are to have sources of employment, then it is essential, it is absolutely vital, that there must be stability of Government and Administration.

Fourthly, Sir, as I have said before, that this EBDO philosophy is not the creation of this regime, it is not the creation of the Martial Law Government, nor is it the creation of the present Government. The philosophy behind EBDO, the logic of the disqualification formula dates back to the Quaid-i-Azam. The Quaid was the first to initiate this measure, and it was continued by the Quaid-i-Millat, for good and sound reason. And why these disqualifications were removed is also well known to this House and to the whole country.

Now, Sir, there is another aspect of the problem, and that is: if you permit individuals to join political parties, and you disqualify them from holding office, that is giving them power without responsibility. The aim of all political parties is to capture power, and it takes all measures to become the government of the country. Now, here is an important fundamental principle involved. If you have people who are disqualified and debarred from holding responsible office, but free to be members of political organizations, how can you ensure a responsible government? In such a situation you saddle people with power—power over the forces, power over our masses, power over ideas, power over moulding people's opinion, and at the same time you debar them from the responsibility of holding office.

That would bring about a sense of complete irresponsibility. They will take impractical issues to he people which are not capable of fulfilment, and yet they will escape blame for it, because they will not have office to fulfil those promises. We know, Sir, how demagogues have taken issues to the people. We know how, without ever believing in issues or in principles, people have tried to say that a certain issue is their religion. We have known how manifestoes have been drafted for political purposes with no intention of fulfilment. Then, Sir, in that case what will happen? You will have complete chaos in the administration. Therefore, Sir, if it is considered necessary to allow them to be members of political parties, it is equally necessary for them to be in a position to take the reins of government in their hands. You must take it to its logical conclusion. It is not so simple by proposing that there is no real objection to membership ; it is not so innocuous. I say it is a serious situation, and it must be taken to its proper conclusion. If you are permitted to be a member of political organizations, you should be permitted to be an office-bearer. Sir, how can you prevent it? It is absolutely illogical—I would call it absolutely immoral. On the one hand you permit a person to become a member, a two-anna member, and on the other you disqualify him from becoming an office-bearer. A two-anna member can be as assertive, can be as important, as an office-bearer, he can be even more important than an office-holder of a political party. I think Mr. Gandhi was not even a four-anna member of the Congress.

So, you see, Sir, if you permit them to become members of the political parties, you must permit them to become office-bearers. If you permit them to become office-bearers of the political parties in charge of the manifesto of the party, in charge of the programme of the party, in charge of the implementation of the programme, and if the party is in a majority and is capable of forming a government, it must be permitted to occupy government office as well. And if you are going to allow them to occupy Government offices as well, then you might as well allow them to threaten the democracy as well, and you might as well again face the consequences of the musical chairs and all the machinations that went with the 15 years or 14 years of history before the Martial Law was imposed in the country.

(*Interruption*)

Now, Sir, as I have said, it is not a simple matter to let them have the right of becoming members. I would say that if we allow them to become members, then why not remove the EBDO disqualification also?

Sir, these puerile compromises can never build a nation.

If you agree with the thesis that this country must be given an opportunity to develop democracy, then you must agree with proposition that those who destroyed democracy must be kept out. But, on the other hand, if

you think that our people are enlightened, that our people are mature enough and that they can decide issues on merits and that they cannot be swayed by emotions and that these people who originally destroyed democracy will not be permitted to form insidious groups and subvert the process of democracy then it is perfectly all right. It is for this House to determine the future course, you are the law-makers, you can take measures and remove the ban altogether. There is no question of fear. There is no question of individual fear. There is no question of a malicious approach to this problem. It is based on principles and has nothing to do with victimisation. It is for you to decide but let us not have a half way approach. I would like to appeal to all but particularly the younger generation to take this opportunity to make this nation a great and vigorous nation. The leadership of this country cannot be the monopoly of only a few people. It is for them to take on the mantle of leadership. It is for them to go to the people. No one is born a leader. Work together on the basis of principles to wipe out the past stigma, and increase the *per capita* income of our people, serve them honourably, and have respect for them, give them facility for education, for employment. We have not believed in the people in the past. We have had so far only a one sided approach of inter-locking intrigues and Conspiracies. That is how democracy ran in the past. Let us put an end to that sort of democracy. Let us now have a new and vigorous democracy. It is absolutely necessary that we start with a clean slate. But the clean slate must be a clean and not a polluted slate. What is the sense in believing that those who actually destroyed democracy should come back again and ride rough shods on the rights of our people. They have betrayed us everywhere. They have betrayed us on Kashmir. They have betrayed us in our approach to India. They have turned turtle. They were in one party one day and in another on the following day. After 14 years of our history we must settle controversies. We have not settled one controversy so far. They never took a single issue to the people. Had they taken the issues to the people controversies would have been settled but not a single issue was taken to the people. The parity issue was not taken to the people. The issue of One Unit was not taken to the people. They played with the issues like little Caesars. Now should we allow them to come back and exercise dictatorial powers again over the people of Pakistan? Should we allow them to subvert and uproot the cause of democracy? Are we so sentimental and emotional? Can we let the people of Pakistan suffer because of our sentiments? Can we take chance after chance at the cost of our people? Who will be held responsible if there is chaos again? After all Pakistan was not created for chaos and confusion. Adolf Hitler said he was responsible for anything that happened to Germany. He died, he was turned into ashes, but the whole nation suffered as a result of it.

It is all very well to say here that if these people do anything wrong we will be responsible for it. But this is not a question of individual responsibility. It is the responsibility of the people because it is they who will have to suffer, and it is the people's right that has to be protected.

(*Interruption*)

It is ironical that elections were held for the first time when Martial Law was imposed in the country. No general elections were held before that. I will tell you how the elections were held before Martial Law.

Under the old constitution it was possible to be a Minister for six months or so and thereafter get elected. A Chief Minister was brought into office by this method and he had to seek a by-election. So, Sir, the poor individual who had the courage to file a nomination paper was huddled into a car and thrown into the desert. When after a day or two he returned he enquired from the successful Chief Minister if there was no law and order in the land. The Chief Minister replied that in his realm there was no law but only order and that was his order. That is the way elections were held. Now, Sir, these men have got glass jaws and glass hearts. The time for the completion of the nomination papers and declaration of results was 12 noon. At 9-30 the Chief Minister filed his nomination paper but he could not wait till 12 in case someone else came to file a nomination paper. His will was the will of God. The time was to be changed and an order issued changing the time from 9-30 to 12 noon.

Then, Sir, we talked about party discipline. The Vice-President of the Pakistan Muslim League was taken on joy ride on a camel, a weak man, a feeble man, was taken on a joy ride and he almost died. He suffered all this merely because he had the courage to oppose the great Chief Minister who was also a member of the same political party. These were the elections and this was the way party discipline enforced.

We are today blamed and questioned why UAR did not support us on Kashmir why did UAR abstain and a barrage of questions are asked as if we are responsible for the attitude of UAR.

I would not like to go into details, I would not like to mention cases because the other side should also have the opportunity to address this House. Therefore, I would not like to go into details but at the same time it is essential that we should not forget these things. We talk so liberally about free elections, we talk so openly about the fulfilment of democracy but we must talk of it in the context of what has happened in the past.

(*Interruptions*)

As far as East Pakistan is concerned it can be said that the development budget of East Pakistan shortly after Partition was about Rs. 9 crores,

thereafter it was increased to Rs. 19 crores and when we had an East Pakistani Prime Minister it was increased to about Rs. 27 crores. Last year there was a record budget of Rs. 89 crores and this year of Rs. 109 crores and that should be considered substantial. But that is not the issue here. The point is this that we have done everything possible to try and bring about development in the country. Every effort has been made to channel our resources both in East and West Pakistan. It must be admitted that the economic activity that has taken place in East Pakistan in the last three years has been really remarkable.

Speech in the National Assembly on July 11, 1962

Constitution and the Ideology of Pakistan—Constitution and the Ordinary Laws of the Land

Sir, the purpose of every political party in a country is to become the Government of that country. It strives to take over the control of government, through democratic means in a democracy and if that is the prime purpose of political parties, then when it becomes the government, it is to implement and enforce the Constitution of the land which is the fundamental law of the country. The Constitution of Pakistan, Sir, clearly states that in the preamble—

> "And whereas the founder of Pakistan, Quaid-i-Azam, Mohammad Ali Jinnah, expressing the will of the people, declared that Pakistan should be a democratic State based on Islamic principles of social justice."

And further on also it says:

> "The principles of democracy, freedom, equality, tolerance and social justice, as enunciated by Islam, should be fully observed in Pakistan."

In the Principles of Law-making and of Policy, it is again enunciated in the Constitution that there shall be no law which is repugnant to Islam, and to Quran and the Sunnah. In addition to that, Sir, there is the Advisory Council of Islamic Ideology which is to recommend to the Legislature whether a law is opposed to or in conflict with the ideology of Pakistan. Therefore, it is my submission, Sir, that this amendment is *ultra vires* of this Constitution and cannot be taken up by this House in the form of a Bill. It has been said on the floor of this House that if 99% of the people want to bring about a change, 1% cannot prevent it. But actually the 1% have a right to prevent it if it is against the ideology, if it is against the fundamental law of the country. For instance if 99% of the people of Pakistan were to get together and say that Pakistan should be dissolved, 1% of the people

have a right to stop it. In the same way we have the inherent right to protect and defend the Constitution. A political party will be failing in its duty if it were to negate the ideology of Pakistan, which is reflected in the Constitution and in the struggle for Pakistan. Therefore, Sir, my point of order is that the amendment is *ultra vires.*

(*Interposition*)

There seems to be some confusion. Distinction should be drawn between the Constitution and the ordinary laws of the land. The Constitution is the fundamental law. Others are the ordinary laws which derive their validity from the source which is the Constitution. The issues raised by my learned friend Ch. Fazal Elahi regarding certain laws that flow from the Constitution are not relevant. Whether they are repugnant to Islam is an entirely separate question. Whether a law is Islamic or not is a question which can be determined by the procedure laid down in the Constitution. So, that is entirely a separate question. It is not relevant to the point that I raised in this House and that is whether an amendment or a law can be passed which is unconstitutional or which is against the provisions of the Constitution. I hope I have made myself abundantly clear, Sir. Now, in this case I have not said that a particular law or a Bill may be passed whether that is in conformity with Islam or not. There is a procedure laid down for that. I have said a Bill is invalid *ab initio* if it is repugnant to the Constitution itself. If you remove the ideological content from clause 3 it violates the Constitution. Whether it is Islamic or not is not relevant. Sir, in the Constitution it is clearly laid down that Islam is the basis of our State. This is the position. Now whether the preamble is operative or not. A preamble is the key of the Constitution. It is the manifesto of the Constitution and in this manifesto of the constitution, in this ideal charter of the constitution it is stated that Pakistan shall be an ideological state in contradistinction to a territorial State. That is a main point. That the State of Pakistan shall be an ideological State and not a territorial State. If there is a challenge to our ideology we will prove the superiority of our ideology We .are proud to be Muslims. We will die for our religion and we will die for our ideology.

(*Interruption*)

So, Sir, my first point is that I am not referring to laws that are passed under the Constitution. I am referring to the Constitution itself and, therefore, the points raised by Ch. Fazal Elahi and Mr. Abul Quasem are not relevant. Secondly, I have said the whole purport of the Constitution must be considered. The preamble contains that Pakistan is to be an ideological State in contradistinction to a territorial State. If the prime object and purpose of political parties is to take over the Government of a country,

it is necessary for them to conform to the spirit and mandate of the Constitution. If Pakistan is to be an ideological State it is imperative for political parties to function in conformity with the fundamental dictates of the Constitution. A deletion of the ideal from the purpose and principles of a political party would be a negation of the constitutional propriety. That is my one point. Secondly, Sir, it has been said that the Constitution also permits equal rights to the minority community, and if we accept this principle then it would render the minority community into second class citizens. This is also entirely incorrect. When we say that Pakistan is to be an Islamic State, it is presupposed that minorities will have equal rights and privileges. This is the greatness of Islam. It allows every minority to flourish, but at the same time, Sir, equality of rights to the minorities does not mean that the minorities can seize power and destroy the very basis of the State. That can never be permitted and shall never be permitted. If you destroyed the ideology of Pakistan, you destroyed Pakistan itself and that can never be permitted under any circumstances whether constitutional or not. So, the question of equality of rights of the minority is not a problem.

Speech in the National Assembly on November 27, 1962

Phases of Pakistani Foreign Policy—Indian Hostility—Alternatives for Pakistan—Sino-Indian Conflict—Pakistan and China—Western Arms for India.

Pakistan has, since its birth, been faced with one crisis after another. But of all of them, the present one is perhaps the most serious, both as regards its nature, and its possible consequences. Without doubt, we are in the vortex of grave historic events, in which the difference between a right and a false move might well mean the difference between survival and disaster. The crisis which we face today, however, is but the reflection of a world torn by a relentless conflict of ideals. Instead of generating hope and providing for an easing of international tensions, the Titans, through their animosity, are leading the world to the brink of total annihilation.

It has been said of great historic figures that they stride the world to make epochs, to bless, confuse or appeal. May I ask what kind of epoch, are the great figures of the present day about to make? In a matter of minutes, cities can be destroyed and an entire countryside laid waste.

For fifteen years the great powers have talked of disarmament, but with what result? Not a single division has been disbanded, not a single weapon destroyed. Disarmament, like peace, must begin in the minds of men. That process has yet to start. Therefore, to appeal to the nations of the world to lay aside their arms is futile. Across our own borders, we see a stampede towards increasing national armaments.

As is well-known, people in the under-developed countries are on the verge of starvation. That being so, to dissipate whatever resources they

have in revengeful warlike ventures will bring no good to these teeming millions. They dream of new vistas of prosperity which oppressive colonial rule had denied them for centuries.

The present phase is thus one of danger as well as of opportunity. There is myopia and madness enough to bring about utter ruination. But we can still avert the catastrophe and our dreams of a great and glorious future for our people and for others can still be realised.

A united Pakistan can make an important contribution to peace in our region and to a better life for all peoples. Shall we have the will and courage to do that? This is a moment of agonising reappraisal. At this moment we cannot isolate our thoughts from the Sino-Indian conflict in which are involved more than a thousand million people.

From time immemorial, there have been two ways, and there can be only two ways of settling disputes, namely : (a) war, and (b) peaceful means. The Charter of the United Nations makes it obligatory on all states to resolve their disputes by peaceful means.

In the event of a conflict between the great powers, a resort to arms must defeat the very purpose of going to war. For with the present precarious balance of power, described by Sir Winston Churchill as the balance of terror, there can be neither victor nor vanquished. But, in actual fact peaceful procedures are the only sensible ones also for the settlement of disputes between lesser powers. This is precisely what has been suggested to India by the Chinese Prime Minister, not once, not twice, but repeatedly.

To our utter astonishment, instead of accepting this as the only sane course open to men of goodwill, India is persisting in the folly of whipping up frenzy against its neighbour, a colossus that cannot be destroyed, a neighbour that only asks for the rectification and adjustment of its borders, as a sovereign equal and not as a colonial vassal. China's call for the demarcation of the Sino-Indian boundary is not a capricious act. In that sense, it is unlike the ways followed by imperialism since the map of Europe was redrawn at the great Congress of Vienna in 1815 to satisfy the personal ambitions of rulers and the territorial ambitions of powerful nations. I shall revert to the Indo-Chinese conflict a little later. At this stage I should like to say a few words about foreign policy in general.

The foreign policy of a nation is a manifestation of its sovereignty. If a people enjoys all power, except the right to conduct foreign relations, it cannot be regarded as independent. For this reason, people take special pride and interest in their foreign policy. It is the visible aspect of a country's independence.

Stability of government and its concomitant, continuity of policy, are more important in the realm of external affairs than in that of internal

affairs.

This does not mean that foreign policy should not be dynamic. It only means that it should not change abruptly. If national interests so demand, foreign policy must change; but the change must be orderly. The shift should be executed gradually, without violent fluctuations like autumn changing into winter or winter into spring.

In fifteen years, ever since independence, Pakistan's foreign policy has passed through three important phases: Phase I marked an attempt to establish the credentials of Pakistan's statehood in the face of massive Indian propaganda that Pakistan was a monstrosity and a transient phenomenon. International recognition in its fullest sense was sought and obtained during those agonising years. But, notwithstanding recognition, the country remained isolated. Taking advantage of that isolation, India, without completely satisfying its gargantuan territorial appetite, swallowed up Hyderabad, Junagadh and a good part of Kashmir.

Phase II saw an attempt to create and establish solidarity with the Islamic world. Considerable misunderstanding arose because of the naivety and extravagance of some of the gestures made by us to achieve this end. We, as a new nation, were not fully versed in the complexities and nuances of international affairs. If our approach had been a measured one, cautious and dignified, the resultant misunderstandings, to use a better word than suspicions, might not have been so harmful. We tried to over-simplify a complex problem. This was the painful period of our greatest disillusionment.

Relying too literally on the Islamic precept that all Muslims are brothers, we sought to create a brotherhood of Muslim peoples at a time when the force of Arab nationalism was in full flood; and its ideological basis was different from that of our own nation. The Arab States were under various types of political regimes, and were divided amongst themselves. They could not unite even in the face of the Israeli menace. How then could they have been expected to collaborate with the new-born non-Arab nation of Pakistan in the pursuit of an ethereal ideal?

Pakistan came into being in 1947 and Israel was established in 1948. The word "partition" became poison to the Arabs. Intensive propaganda was unleashed in the Arab nations to the effect that the British, out of vicious parting spite and in accordance with their old policy of "divide and rule", sought to lacerate the Arab world, in a manner similar to what they had done in India. This propaganda, although wholly false, did create in certain Arab circles a resentment against the division of the sub-continent and, consequently, against Pakistan.

Pakistan, however, made strenuous efforts to create goodwill in the Arab world. Our endeavours in the cause of the Arab peoples are seldom

remembered. Repeatedly, we are reminded of the blunders committed by Pakistan during the Suez crisis. It is relevant that this only flaw in our policy towards the Arab States came at a time when internal confusion in Pakistan had reached its high water mark. That flaw has now become the cause of permanent resentment and slander against Pakistan. This, notwithstanding the fact that the balance-sheet, with Suez on the debit side, is wholly favourable to Pakistan. I beseech you to note the significant contribution Pakistan has made to the cause of the Arab people:

(a) Pakistan was the most eloquent opponent of the State of Israel and, to this day, we have refused to have any dealings with that State. On the other hand, India, the neutral friend of a powerful neutral Arab country, has considerably improved its relations with Israel;

(b) our continued political, moral and financial support to the cause of the Palestine Arab refugees; and

(c) our endeavours in the United Nations for the independence of Libya, Somalia, Eritrea, Morocco, Tunisia and, finally, our support for the independence of Algeria.

It has been said that our role in the Algerian crisis should have been more forthright. There must be some consistency in our thought and action. We have always said that Kashmir was the most fundamental question for Pakistan. At the same time, some people wanted us to jeopardise our position about Kashmir in the Security Council, of which France is a permanent member, by giving recognition to Algeria. Even if the United Nations alone cannot settle the Kashmir dispute, the question is, nevertheless, pending before it. For the sake of argument, suppose we had given *de facto* recognition to Algeria three years earlier than we did, would that have brought freedom to Algeria? If our recognition had any chance of preventing further bloodshed, we might have taken the risk for the sake of the great and heroic people of Algeria. But such was not the case. Despite our high stake in the favourable disposition of the Security Council, in which France has always given Pakistan unequivocal support, we incurred the risk of alienating France by recognising the Provisional Government when Algeria needed it most. And this we did much before it was recognized by India, a country which proclaims itself to be the champion of moral causes.

The Muslim world is not confined to the Arab States. It includes Turkey, Iran, Malaysia, Indonesia, the countries of the Maghreb and many other countries of Africa. Most of these countries were themselves going through a metamorphosis. In their effort to survive and reconstruct their national life, they could not hope to draw much strength from our people, suffering from the same problems as themselves.

We had to adjust our approach not only to the rivalries of the Arab

States *inter se* but also to the Arab-Turkish and the Arab-Iranian tensions —tensions which are deeply rooted in history.

Basically, the forces of nationalism clashed with the spirit of resurgent Islamic sentiment that flowed from the new State of Pakistan. Besides, we were so wholly beset by our internal problems that we could not make a full effort in pursuit of the grandiose mission of creating a fraternal rallying centre for the Muslim States. Had we succeeded, it might have been the greatest development in contemporary international relations. However, the irresistible and irrepressible forces of nationalism burst forth like a mighty flood, sweeping all before it.

We succeeded, nevertheless, in evoking sympathy and support in the Muslim countries of Iran and Turkey. But, in these two countries also, the drive towards modernism has brought about conflicts between orthodox and progressive forces, so much so that Islam as a political factor does not count in either of them.

Our friendship with the great people of Turkey and Iran is something highly significant. These countries have been our steadfast friends in all our difficulties and we deeply value the warm feelings which exist between their people and ours.

Before proceeding to the third phase, I shall make a brief reference to the Foreign Office. Many uncharitable attacks have been made on the Foreign Office for its alleged failure to project the proper image of Pakistan in the Muslim world.

It is admitted that the Foreign Office suffers from certain obvious limitations. It must not, however, be forgotten that, in this shrinking world of ours, in which communications have reached a point of near perfection, there is little scope for ambassadors and envoys plenipotentiary to bring about a decisive change in the attitudes of the countries to which they are accredited. In this jet age, distance is no longer a factor. The ambassador has been short-circuited by direct links between heads of governments and heads of states. In modern diplomacy, the role of the ambassador does not have the importance which it had in the past, when ambassadors were allowed to act on their own authority and initiative. Today they exercise only a marginal influence on the attitudes of foreign governments. They are no longer expected to take independent decisions. They merely communicate the policy of the government they represent to the government to which they are accredited. It is, therefore, the foreign policy of a country which is of supreme importance.

During the last four years, I have had considerable dealings with the Foreign Office. I have on two occasions led our Delegations to the United Nations and have represented Pakistan on several important missions. On these occasions I have sought to establish personal contacts with most

of our foreign service representatives. I have had the opportunity to observe their work closely.

In my opinion, there are a number of incompetent persons in the foreign service and if it were in my hands, I would have sent them packing long ago. Perhaps, that day might still come. Having said this, I should like to state emphatically, that by and large, our foreign service is the cream of the country's public services. Individuals are not chosen by subjective procedures; they are chosen on the basis of an examination of a high standard. Those selected for the foreign service are generally those who top the list of successful candidates. It is by this criterion alone that we have built up our foreign service. If there is something wrong with the foreign service, which represents the highest intellectual standards of the country, then there is something wrong with those standards. It is not proper to generalise and put too much blame on the Foreign Office and those who represent Pakistan abroad. Most of them are working under very difficult conditions. Many of our young men, who are talented and dedicated, would be a source of pride to any country. I have seen some of them working under great stress and strain and doing excellent work. In some places, a single individual acts as a cypher officer, an office assistant as well as a diplomat. It would not be fair, therefore, to brand the whole Foreign Office as inefficient and incapable. Apart from the fact that such condemnation is not justified, it would have the effect of demoralising our foreign service most of whose officers are doing splendid work abroad.

I now return to the third phase of our country's foreign policy. After having exhausted our natural urge to bring about solidarity in the Muslim world, we sought to break our isolation by linking ourselves with the West. To that end we began negotiations with the West. When these had advanced sufficiently, on 17th November 1953, the Government of the United States of Amercia formally informed the Government of India that it was considering a Military Assistance Agreement with Pakistan in order to strengthen the free world's defences in South Asia. As a result of this development, we came to be associated with the three Muslim States of Iran, Turkey and Iraq—the only Arab State—in a pact of mutual co-operation signed between Iraq and Turkey in February 1955, and acceded to by Pakistan in September 1955.

This was a turning point in our history. The critical and dangerous period of our isolation was over and we were now aligned with nations which were prepared to come to our assistance in the event of Communist aggression against us.

The full measure of an achievement can be judged fairly and accurately by its effect, such as satisfaction among one's friends and anger or fear among one's adversaries. What was the reaction in India to our joining the

Pacts? The whole Indian nation went hoarse in condemning Pakistan's alliance with the Western countries.

I shall refer only to a few of the utterances in this connection, of the Indian Prime Minister, Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru. In a speech in November 1953, he said:

"It is a matter of the most intense concern to us and something which will have more far-reaching consequences on the whole structure of things in South Asia and specially on India and Pakistan. I am rather surprised, therefore, that this very major development should take place in the way in which apparently it is taking place.

"It is open to Pakistan to have bases, to have foreign arms, to have anything it likes on its territory. It is even open to it to give up its independence, if it so chooses, or to limit it ; but we are concerned with the consequences of these pacts and, therefore, necessarily we are watching these developments with the greatest care."

On 22nd March 1954, Mr. Nehru was quoted as saying:

"I venture to say that it is not easy to imagine even any aggression on Pakistan, as things are, either from that great country, China, or from India, regardless of motives. How then does this question of aggression arise suddenly and is made a pretext for this kind of military aid being given ? From Pakistan's side I am only unaware of any possible reason which I can understand.

"For may part I would welcome the strengthening of Pakistan economically and even militarily in the normal sense. If they build themselves up, I can have no complaint. But this is not normal procedure. It is a very abnormal procedure, upsetting normalcy ; and insofar as it upsets normalcy, it is a step away from peace.

"Now the President of the United States has stated that if the aid given to Pakistan is misused and directed against any country for aggression, he will undertake to thwart such an aggression. I have no doubt that the President is opposed to aggression. But we know from past experiences that aggression takes place and nothing is done to thwart it. The military aid given by the United States to Pakistan is likely to create conditions which facilitate and encourage aggression.

"As I have said repeatedly, this grant of military aid by the United States to Pakistan creates a grave situation for us in India and for Asia. It adds to our tensions: it makes it much more difficult to solve the problems, which have confronted India and Pakistan."

On 22nd March 1956, Mr. Nehru in a speech in the Indian Lok Sabha, stated that while a war between India and Pakistan was unlikely, one could not ignore the possibility of some emergency arising. Pakistan, he said, had received military aid and this posed a terrible problem for India from

the point of view of the diversion of her resources from development to military needs. Mr. Nehru said that he was intervening in the debate to draw the attention of the House to certain broad and basic principles underlying defence. He had noted in the course of the debate a certain anxiety and concern about recent events, "amounting to almost an apprehension and fear lest India might be attacked by our neighbour country (Pakistan) and we might not be ready for it. It is perfectly true that the situation today in regard to the defence of India has been very much affected by this factor of military aid coming in from a great country. We have to view this situation, therefore, in this new light."

By way of a final instance, I shall refer to Mr. Nehru's remarks in the Rajya Sabha on 6th March, 1959, when he is reported to have stated:

"I would like to add that during the past few weeks when talks about this pact have been going on, we have drawn the attention of the U.S. Government to our concern about such pacts and more specially the prospect of this agreement leading to greater military aid to Pakistan, and even otherwise affecting us adversely . . . We have been assured all along by the representatives of the U.S. Government that this (aid) was aimed . . . against communist aggression . . .

"We have been specifically assured that this agreement (the bilateral agreement between the United States and Pakistan) cannot be used against India . . . We have repeatedly pointed out that the United States defence aid to Pakistan encourages the Pakistan authorities in their aggressiveness and increases tension and conflict between India and Pakistan. . .

"We welcome the assurance given to us by the United States authorities but aggression is difficult to define, and Pakistan authorities have in the past committed aggression and continued it . . . It is difficult for us to ignore the possibility of Pakistan utilising the aid received by it from other countries against India, even though those other countries have given us clear assurances to the contrary."

Let us now turn to foreign policy in the context of the present international situation. This situation is such as to afford us little scope for manoeuvrability. In the formation of foreign policy today there are three courses open to nations:

(1) alliance with the Western democracies;
(2) alliance with or, to be more accurate, subservience to Communist states; and
(3) an un-coordinated fraternization with the neutralist states.

Since the end of the Second Wold War, despite the strenuous efforts made to strengthen the rule of law through the United Nations, there has been a definite bi-polarization of power. The world has been split into two

camps—the Communist and the non-Communist. During the last fifteen years, on more than one occasion, the world has come to the brink of disaster. The intense rivalry between the two power *blocs* is leading humanity towards a dangeous crisis and confronting it with the awesome possibility of a nuclear war. Should such a war break out, civilization will be in ashes. Ideologies and social systems will form part of the debris. The endeavours that have so far been made to abate this rivalry between the *blocs* have not succeeded.

The United Nations is still the most encouragingg instrument of peace in the hands of man. Despite its inadequacies, it has, on numerous occasions, interposed its pacifying counsel to save the world from scourge of total war, as in the case of Suez, Berlin, the Congo and, most recently, Cuba. In fact, its intervention in such circumstances has become essential for the resolution of disputes between nations.

In recent years a third force has been evolving. It claims to act as a restraining influence on the passions of the major rivals. This is the force of the neutralist states whose numbers are growing. But they lack intrinsic strength and the means to transform their nebulous ideals into a bridge between the two nuclear colossuses.

I have described the third course as ambiguous because the neutral states have no positive mission backed by a readiness to assume the multilateral obligations, which that mission would entail. They claim to dispose of each issue on its merits. But in assuming this posture, they are often divided amongst themselves. Even collectively, they are not sufficiently powerful to play a decisive role in the settlement of disputes. More important, the fact is that neither the Soviet Union nor Communist China recognizes as final the validity of the role of this so-called third force. Stalin called it a deception. Mao Tse-tung has often said that a third road does not exist. "To sit on the fence," he said as far back as July 1948, "is impossible. A third road does not exist. Not only in China but also in the world, without exception, one either leans to the side of imperialism or socialism."

It is only in recent years that the pragmatic Mr. Khrushchev, acting on Lenin's strategy of "two steps forward, one step back" has eulogised the role of neutralism in the quest for peaceful co-existence. He has, consequently, been accused by Communist China of a revisionist performance. In the United States of America, John Foster Dulles, the astute architect of contemporary American diplomacy, termed neutralism as "immoral". In the United States also it is but recently that Harvard intellectuals, the Kissingers and Schlesingers, have deviated from the traditional path, to lionise neutralism, much to the detriment of America's long-term vital interests.

Among the neutralist countries, the role of India, up to the present at least, has been the most active. India has been the piper that has played the

tune which, on the whole, has sounded jarring only to the West.

The main driving force behind a nation's foreign policy is its urge to maintain its independence and territorial integrity. Pakistan, situated as it is, surrounded by hostile neighbours, must seek arrangements guaranteeing its territorial integrity and permitting it to preserve its distinct ideological personality. The degree of a nation's external dependence is conditioned by its strength and stability, the vitality of its institutions and the strength of its national purpose. Time and again, we have been told that our alliances with the West have robbed us of our independence. This is not correct.

In the present international balance of power, there are hardly three or four states which can claim to be sovereign in the absolute sense of the term. Furthermore, the progress of international law has made it incumbent even on these few states to shed a part of their sovereignty. Membership of the United Nations entails far-reaching restrictions on the sovereignty of its member states.

The Charter of the United Nations calls upon its members to renounce some of the most important aspects of the classical form of sovereignty, *e.g.*, the right to make war. Article 2, Paragraph 4 of the Charter declares:

> "All Members shall refrain in their international relations from the threat or use of force against the territorial integrity or political independence of any state, or in any other manner inconsistent with the purposes of the United Nations."

The member states are, therefore, obliged not to resort to force or the threat of force. They are called upon to accept a settlement of their international disputes by peaceful means.

Incidentally, I should like the House to note that this is the very principle which India, has, ever since its independence, been consistently preaching to all states but which India itself has persistently violated and continues to violate in its own international dealings.

To return to my main point, I submit that the degree of independence of a country within the four corners of international law is determined more by the country's own strength and will to independence than by its external affiliations, such as the membership of Pacts. Indeed, the ability of a country to enter into a treaty or a Pact is itself a demonstration of its independence. No dependent country is competent to conclude a treaty.

If Pakistanis feel that they are not independent enough, they themselves are to blame for it and not the fact of their membership of the Pact. We should do everything in our power to develop our internal resources and decrease our economic dependence on outside sources of assistance. Our economic dependence on foreign powers is in no way related to our membership of the Pacts.

I have scrutinised every word of the relevant treaties in an attempt to

discover if there is any provision stipulating that Pakistan's internal budget is to be supported by counterpart funds or by PL-480 funds. If we are able to mobilise our own resources, it would be a relief to us as well as to those who assist us.

Pakistan is not the first or the only recipient of foreign aid. The United States of America literally pulled Europe out of economic degradation through massive aid under the Marshall Plan. Germany, defeated and divided, destroyed and decimated by the combined might of the Allied Powers, was a debris but only a decade ago. By skilful utilisation of foreign aid and the determination to be free of it, Germany has burgeoned into a mighty power. Today its economy is as vital as that of the country which not very long ago gave it economic aid.

In the same manner, among other Western European nations, France Italy and the United Kingdom have been enabled to regain their economic independence through Marshall Aid.

If the purpose of the aid were to make countries permanently dependent on foreign assistance, these great European States would not have been able to revive their economies with the infusion of aid. It is, therefore, the betrayal of a senile complex to assert that economic aid carries with it the virus of permanent dependence.

Time magazine in its issue of 23rd November 1962, has made certain interesting comments on foreign aid. It reports:

> "Within the Kennedy Administration, a process of rethinking the ends and means of foreign aid is under way. The inevitable New Frontier 'task force' has been appointed, and among its basic texts is a tough article by the University of Chicago's Professor Hans Morgenthau in the June issue of the *American Political Science Review*.
>
> "Morgenthau takes a scholarly scalp to the concept of economic development aid. It has, he says, 'a very much smaller range of potentially successful operation than is generally believed'. Many under-developed countries 'suffer from deficiencies, some natural and insuperable, others social and remediable, which no amount of capital and technological know-how, supplied from the outside, can cure'. There are 'bum and beggar nations' that, unless a 'miraculous transformation' of character takes place, cannot or will not use foreign aid for genuine economic development."

It is against our national pride to be called a "bum and beggar nation". But, let us at this time of the agonising reappriasal of our policies indict ourselves for the weaknesses for which we alone are responsible.

I have always advocated the normalization of relations with the Soviet Union and Communist China. I do not believe that our membership of the Pacts is incompatible with such an approach. It was in pursuance of this

objective that I sponsored the conclusion of the Oil Agreement between Pakistan and the Soviet Union. There is a great deal of territory on which we can meet the Communist world as friends in the common cause of preserving world peace.

We, as a nation of nearly one hundred million people, the fifth largest in the world, can play a role in the normalization of international relations and in the reduction of international tensions. The Soviet Union is our close neighbour. In the long and stormy march of history, our paths have often crossed. There has been a intermingling of races and cultures in our two regions. The great heritage which scions of the House of Timur brought to us from what today is Soviet Central Asia, inspires us and will continue to inspire us. During my visit to Samarkand, Tashkent and other places in those parts, I was amazed to witness the great affinity of cultures and outlook between their people and ours. I was amazed because, in spite of the high mountains that separate us and the lack of contacts during the past centuries, there was abundant evidence of the indissoluble links between our two regions. We extend the hand of friendship to the Soviet Union on terms of equality and self-respect. However, the Soviet Union, for its own reasons, has been unsympathetic to us in respect of a problem which is fundamental to our future. Until it can better appreciate the objective merits of that problem, I am afraid that, despite all our wishes, we cannot completely normalize our relations with that great country.

The case of the People's Republic of China is entirely different. We admire the People's Republic of China for not having adopted a hostile stand on Kashmir, in spite of the fact that in the past our relations with that great Asian neighbour of ours were not as cordial as they are today. In a book called *Panchsheela and After,* written by Girilal Jain, the author has said:

> "During Mr. Chou En-lai's visit to India in 1956-57, the Chinese Prime Minister was repeatedly asked to define his Government's policy on the issue of the Indo-Pakistan dispute over Kashmir. Mr. Chou En-lai was, unlike the Soviet leaders, non-committal. This lends some indirect confirmation to unconfirmed reports then prevalent in New Delhi that the Chinese rulers were not wholly averse to the idea of having a deal with Pakistan on the Kashmir issue."

Let us be big enough to admit our faults, for which the present Government is not responsible. When the Central Government of the People's Republic of China was established, we recognized their new regime and initially supported its admission to the United Nations. Thereafter, advantage was taken of our domestic confusion and weakness and, presumably under pressure, we reversed our position. For a number of years, we did not support the People's Republic of China's admission to the United Nations.

Now, it is not unnatural for friendly countries to persuade one another to accept a particular point of view. This is a part of international relations. For instance, even in domestic affairs, as Minister of Industries, I might try to persuade the Commerce Minister to accept my point of veiw, but if he rejects it, that does not mean that he has not succumbed to my "pressure".

What is tragic is the willingness to succumb easily to pressures. This inevitably happens when there is internal weakness. The very fact that the same allies could not prevail upon the present Government to continue the previous policy against the admission of Communist China to the United Nations is evidence of the independence of our present foreign policy, even within the context of our alliances. On merits, we have been able to revert to our original stand because the present Government is strong and stable enough to do so. We have in the past two years supported the admission of Communist China to the United Nations. It would be beneficial to all mankind if the People's Republic of China were to become a member of the World Organisation. How is it possible for the United Nations to bring to bear the full weight of authority on any issue when the representatives of 650 million people are excluded from its deliberations and discipline?

Without further ado, let me declare that we have no ill-will against China, that we have no territorial disputes with that country, that our relations with it are normal and cordial, and that we appreciate the attitude of China on the Kashmir question and that attitude, we hope, will become more positive with further improvement in our mutual relations.

For its part China has assured us that our membership of the Pacts with the West is in no way incompatible with our friendship with China. This friendship is unshakable and unconditional.

It has been reported that the Central People's Government of China has offered a non-aggression Pact to Pakistan. This offer cannot be regarded as inconsistent with our alliances with the West. Our alliances are for self-defence. A non-aggression Pact further reinforces the defensive character of those alliances.

I declare that our friendship with China is not tainted by any form of bargain or barter. It is steadfast amity between two neighbouring Asian States comprising over 750 million people.

We can maintain a posture of friendship with the People's Republic of China and of normalization of relations with the Soviet Union. We can do that without violating the sanctity of our Pacts with our Western allies, who were the first to enable us to break out of our isolation.

As far as the neutral states are concerned, we have tried to maintain normal relations with all of them. If our relations with the UAR were not happy a number of years ago, the fault is not that of this Government. Ever since the revolutionary regime came into power, it has sought sedulously

to improve relations with the United Arab Republic and with all other Middle Eastern and African countries, including Nigeria, Ghana and the Arab States of the Maghreb. It has also sought to improve relations with other important neutralist states, notably Yugoslavia.

Having broadly dealt with the three political divisions of the world, I should now like to briefly address myself to all those who call upon us to abandon the Pacts and become "scrupulously neutral". Under the present circumstances it cannot be denied that India is the lynch-pin of the neutralist combination. Therefore, if we were to pitch our tent in the neutralist camp, we would become subject to Indian hegemony and to its machiavellian manoeuvres. Until the Kashmir dispute is settled, we cannot think of becoming a part of a sphere of influence dominated by India.

I do not think there is anyone in Pakistan who would like this country to become a satellite of a heterogeneous concert of relatively weak and vacillating nations, of which India is the leader. Moreover, to what extent and how effectively the neutralist countries came to India's rescue in its present conflict with China is all too well-known.

The Commonwealth of Nations cannot be regarded as a separate ideological sphere of influence. Its older members are in the Western camp and most of the new ones are in the neutralist camp. However, our relations with almost all the Commonwealth countries are very cordial.

Britain has been much maligned. It has been said that Britain was against the partition and that the last Viceroy of the Indian Empire and the first Governor-General of independent India, Lord Mountbatten, was hostile to Pakistan. Be that as it may. All that is part of history. We have to reckon with its legacy. One of the weaknesses, or shall I say virtues, of the Anglo-Saxon is that he is, basically, a realist. As such, the Anglo-Saxon has no permanent attitudes. Moreover, it is given to that race to grudgingly admire those that come into conflict with it. The classic example is that of Germany. There is no doubt that the British admired and at one time feared the indomitable spirit and courage of the Muslims. In their bid for a world empire they found in Islam their most formidable foe.

The great British historian Arnold Toynbee, in his book *Civilisation on Trial,* observes:

> "Centuries before Communism was heard of, our ancestors found their bugbear in Islam. As lately as the sixteenth century, Islam inspired the same hysteria in Western hearts as Communism in the twentieth century, and this essentially for the same reason. Like Communism, Islam was an anti-Western movement which was at the same time a heretical version of a Western faith; and, like Communism, it wielded a sword of the spirit against which there was no defence in material armaments."

But, when the dictates of reality demanded, the British suppressed their

traditional hostility to Islam and supported the Turkish Empire against Czarist Russia's expansionist urges. Historical memories are most profound among those with whom swords have been crossed. The bravery of the Muslims remains a living legend in Britian.

Today, however, the British are more to be sympathised with than to be envied. Their great Empire, on which the sun never set, is now shrunk to a small and vulnerable island, open to complete destruction by thermonuclear weapons. Napoleon Bounaparte called the British a nation of shopkeepers. Today its shops have become part of a European Market and Britannia cannot tilt the scales of power one way or the other. We have no rancour against Britain, but if it influences the United States to upset the balance of power in this region, it will be committing a hostile act against Pakistan. We shall be forced to take notice of that act and shall not be responsible for its consequences.

I should now like to refer to some of our neighbours.

Although Afghanistan is a Muslim State, it has, unfortunately, from the very beginning, pursued an incomprehensible inimical policy towards Pakistan. We, on the other hand, have exercised restraint in the face of continuous provocation. On numerous occasions, Pakistan has sought to improve its relations with Afghanistan. But that country, obviously in order to distract its people's attention from internal stresses, has endeavoured to channel all their bitterness in the direction of Pakistan by making fictitious claims to our territory.

Every inch of Pakistani territory is sacred and inviolable. Unless and until, therefore, Afghanistan abandons the pursuit of its peurile expansionist aims, none can expect an improvement in the relations between Afghanistan and Pakistan and none can hold Pakistan responsible for the present state of those relations.

Nepal, very near to East Pakistan, is our proximate neighbour. Notwithstanding this proximity, in the past our contacts with Nepal were restricted. Since the Revolution, our relations with that country have steadily improved. About a year ago, King Mahendra was our honoured guest in Pakistan. We have exchanged several important delegations with Nepal. I might add that constructive efforts are being made by the Government of Pakistan for further developing relations with Nepal.

I now come to India, to the core of our problems. A little over 15 years ago we were citizens of the same country striving for its liberation from the yoke of British colonialism. Because of fundamental differences we parted company and became two separate national States. Many of us had hoped that the bitterness of the past woud be dissolved as each State pursued its own policies according to its own interpretation of the values of life. Much to our regret this has not happened.

Immediately before and after the transfer of power a vast number of people lost their lives. The aftermath of that event was one of horror. The greatest of all migrations known to history took place. There was danger of war between the two countries.

Pakistan, as the smaller country, faced with many more problems and possessing far less resources than India, was the more anxious of the two to come to a settlement of the disputes between them and to live as a good neighbour and, indeed, to establish a permanent *modus vivendi* with India. This policy of peace did not fit into the grand design of India, which was to bring about the disintegration of Pakistan, amongst other things, by creating turmoil and disorder. Instead of passing over the tragic events of 1947 the Indian Government chose to exacerbate the tensions created by the partition. Every step of Indian policy has been taken with the aim of strangulating Pakistan. In this respect the policy of the Indian Government has remained rigid and uncompromising. There is a concatenation of instances as proof of this but I would not like to mention every one of them, for that enumeration would in no way help to improve the situation. It would only pile pain upon the existing agony.

In the very first instance, India refused to honour the financial settlement that was explicitly agreed to as a part of the process of the transfer of power. So unreasonable and damaging to India's reputation was this attitude that even Gandhi objected to it and threatened to go on a hunger strike as a protest against it. Pakistan had, in the meanwhile, taken the matter to the Security Council. India, unable to defend itself before that body, partly fulfilled the agreement. It is not that Gandhi was charitable to Pakistan, but he seemed so. For that reason he was killed by the bullet of a Hindu fanatic who represented that powerful element in India's life which openly seeks the liquidation of Pakistan.

Finance is the blood-stream of a nation, particularly that of a new nation, born in chaos and striving desperately for survival. The Indian Government believed that by not honouring the financial settlement, which formed part of the partition arrangement and by not transferring to Pakistan its predetermined share of the financial assets of undivided India, the economic arteries of Pakistan would be drained of life. To make that more certain, the division and transfer of defence assets and personnel was hampered at every step, with the obvious purpose of denying the new State the means to defend itself. Pakistan never received anything of its share of weapons and vehicles.

The gigantic evacuee property problem, which was the by-product of the migration, also placed Pakistan in a very difficult position. India chose to complicate and delay the solution of the problem. By keeping it unsolved and enlarging its scope, our neighbour forced upon us the stupen-

dous task of rehabilitating the refugees and solving the question of their properties. As if these were not problems enough, the explosive issues of Junagadh and Kashmir and Hyderabad were precipitated. An already tense situation was converted into a conflagration. India marched its armies into Junagadh, Kashmir and Hyderabad in a manner reminiscent of the trampling Nazi jack boots of Hitler's Germany seeking *lebensraum*.

The western part of Pakistan, as every one knows, is wholly dependent on its rivers which irrigate every acre of its cultivable lands. Without these waters, West Pakistan, a most fertile region, would be a veritable desert. India has acquired by its illegal military occupation of Kashmir, the power to stop those waters. Another lethal weapon was thus added to India's armoury for aggression against Pakistan.

These major problems do not include the multitude of irritants, such as incidents of various kinds on the borders of East and West Pakistan and attempts to tamper with East Pakistan rivers. To climax all this animosity, India has repeatedly declared that Pakistan is its Enemy No. 1 and deploys more than two-thirds of its armed forces against Pakistan.

We have been the victim of the combined strength of India's political, economic and military might. Furthermore, by its resourceful propaganda and skilful diplomacy in the chancelleries of the world, India has, behind the facade of its deceptive policy of non-violence and the myth of its peaceful heritage, sought to put Pakistan in the wrong in the eyes of the world. Thus a State, which actually is the victim of India's aggressive actions has been depicted by India as pursuing against it a policy of unwarranted ill-will. This atrocious attempt is without parallel in the history of international relations.

The heart of the Indo-Pakistan problems lies in the Kashmir dispute and in India's arrogant refusal to settle that dispute. India has violated every single agreement entered into by it with regard to Kashmir. On all occasions, Pakistan has agreed to compromise proposals for a settlement. India has rejected every one of them. At one time, during the premiership of Mr. Liaquat Ali Khan, at the Commonwealth Conference in London, it was suggested that Commonwealth troops be posted in Kashmir to ensure a free expression of the will of the people. India rejected that proposal on the ground that the presence of foreign troops on the soil of Kashmir would give the impression that imperialism had returned to the sub-continent. Is it not ironical, that today, India is literally pleading for the presence on her soil of foreign troops and foreign armaments to help in its border clash with China?

It is believed that Military Missions from the United States and Great Britain have visited the NEFA front and have now become the brains trust of the General Headquarters of the Indian Army. Their presence and their

advice have been welcomed in India and are said to have given a sense of security to that country. According to India this is not to be regarded as the return of imperialism, but for refusing the stationing of Commonwealth troops in the disputed territory of Kashmir, that was the pretext.

The conflict in regard to Kashmir, painful to all who cherish the cause of peace, is the greatest tragedy of our times. India has dishonoured all its pledges to settle the dispute by means of a plebiscite. But that is not all. As recently stated in this House by its leader, Mr. Mohammed Ali of Bogra, India has taken its stand on the doctrine of "Clausa Rebus Sic Stantibus". This doctrine and the other, "Pacta sunt Servanda", are important in international law. The latter doctrine calls for a rigid adherence to treaties. Under it all peace-loving states are enjoined to carry out their undertakings. The former doctrine gives an opening to adventurous states unilaterally to wriggle out of commitments, voluntarily undertaken by them. By its refusal to honour its pledged word on Kashmir, India has done precisely this and has sought justification for it by evoking this doctrine of dubious moral value. However, it is not given to individual countries themselves to determine whether circumstances have changed or changed so much as to justify the repudiation of a treaty or of a part of it. Obviously, a third party has to determine whether circumstances have really altered, and if so, to what extent. India's former Defence Minister, Mr. Krishna Menon, said in the Security Council that circumstances had changed because of Pakistan's accepting American assistance, and that these changed circumstances rendered the agreement about a plebiscite inoperative. India wants to be the judge in its own case.

I should like to make a reference to the recent fighting between India and China. We know that it is only a border clash, and our view has been substantiated by subsequent events and confirmed by the unilateral cease-fire and the withdrawal of forces on the part of the Chinese. Hostilities have come to an end and China, of its own accord, has at the height of its successes stopped the fighting. Indeed, it could not have demonstrated its peaceful intentions in a more positive fashion than by ordering a unilateral cease-fire, a demonstration for which it would be difficult to find a precedent.

The People's Republic of China has thus shown its eagerness to settle the dispute peacefully rather than by the use of force. The Charter of the United Nations enjoins that all disputes should be settled by peaceful means. Thus China which is not a member of the United Nations, has respected its Charter. India, which is a prominent member of that organization, has ignored it.

India's attitude in this dispute has been unpredictable. But, whatever it be, she has sought to extract the maximum advantage from the present situation. A climate of war hysteria has been created by the Indian

Government, mainly for two purposes: (a) to unite a country that was rapidly falling apart, for, in the face of external danger, people do tend to come together, and (b) to grab foreign military assistance in a massive way. These are both vital purposes. In order to realise them, war-drums are being beaten throughout the length and breadth of India.

As I said in the beginning, this is a phantom war for a bankrupt cause. This is a phony war, so much so that Prime Minister Nehru himself in a broadcast to his nation on 21st October said:

> "We are in the middle of our Third Five-Year Plan. There can be no question of giving up this Plan or reducing any important element of it. We may adapt it to the new requirements here and there. But, essentially the major projects of the Plan must be pursued and implemented, because it is in that way that we shall strengthen our country, not only in the present crisis but in the years to come."

When India's Third Five-Year Plan was framed, its whole emphasis was on peace-time economic development and on the assumption that India would be free from the dangers of war or conflict. It was based on the assumption that India would not face a military conflict. That being the premise of the Plan, it is difficult to understand how under war conditions, it has not become necessary to make radical departures from the principles and objectives of the Plan. To "adapt in here and there" is not what a war situation would demand. It is because the so-called war with China is no more than a border conflict, restricted in its scope and its objective, that the Plan may have to be adapted only "here and there" without making any major changes in it.

On 1st November 1962, the Indian Government, after very careful consideration, finally decided against resorting to any drastic action to regulate the prices of foodgrains and other essential commodities. The Indian Government, "at its highest level" considered it advisable to "pursue broadly existing policies". The Food Ministry was of the view that "there was no need for any concern now about the availability or prices of foodgrains". This important decision was announced by the Government of India on 2nd November and the same day it was carried by all the newspapers.

This is another indication of the fact that the Government of India does not consider itself at war with another State. If India was genuinely involved in a war, or had to make preparations for it, drastic measures to control prices, and particularly those of necessary commodities, such as food and clothing, would have become inevitable in a semi-controlled economy like that of India's. The decision, on the part of India, to maintain normal policies, and, the unilateral cease-fire ordered by the Government of China, clearly indicate that the dispute between India and China is confined to the border question.

Mr. Krishna Menon has been made a scapegoat. He was at least frank enough to give expression to the feeling existing in India against Pakistan, and for that he should be given credit. He represented and reflected the Indians' prevailing genuine feeling of animosity against Pakistan and the intensity of that sentiment. There was no Dr. Jekyll and Mr. Hyde in Mr. Krishna Menon. However, even after his unceremonious dismissal, many think he continues to influence Indian policies from behind the scene. Mr. Krishna Menon, I fear, will continue to dominate the Government of India's attitude towards Pakistan.

The new Defence Minister is a Maharashtrian. He has been chosen for this post to inject a martial spirit into the Indian Government. He is the modern Shivaji. The other day he boasted that—

> "Never in my life have I known defeat. I will not have it now. Let not China forget that side by side with Lord Buddha and Mahaveer, India also produced Rana Partap and Shivaji."

The new Defence Minister warned the Chinese to remember that—

> "The enemy hordes which had won battles in the plains of India had met their Waterloo in the mountainous region of the Deccan."

These are chauvinistic remarks, perhaps intended to be reassuring to the country that was badly mauled and humiliated in the recent border conflict. We are not concerned with the internal changes in the Indian Government, except to the extent that we cannot be expected to embrace the new Shivaji and meet the fate of Afzal Khan. In many ways a Krishna Menon with a loaded pistol pointed at us is to be preferred to the craftily hidden claws of a Shivaji. We have been embraced before by a Shivaji and we know with what result.

All recent developments in India, including cabinet changes, are part of a well-conceived plan, whose aim is to inveigle America and to play on American fears of international Communism. That Nehru has succeeded in creating this situation redounds to his credit, but it is not very flattering to Anglo-American diplomacy.

It is obvious that Nehru has refused a peaceful settlement of the dispute with China in order to derive from it the maximum advantage in the form of the massive arms aid rushed to India by the Western Powers. To get these arms, Nehru has had to break his own image and to violate his much-trumpeted doctrine of Panchsheela. Gone is the proud voice of neutralism. That image has been broken and that doctrine shattered. India, the friend of all except Pakistan, finds herself alone and isolated. Self-assurance and self-confidence have given way to alarm and despondency, for it is now clear that the Indian giant was only the shadow of a small man.

It must be regretfully recognized that the Western Powers want to entice India into their *bloc* and to aggravate its conflict with China. They want to

take obvious advantage of India's desperation and want India to depend upon them. It is not unusual in diplomacy to take advantage of opportunities as they present themselves, but even then certain formalities are as a rule observed. In the present case, the Western Powers went through no formalities whatever before seducing India into their sphere of influence. India is refusing a peaceful settlement of the problem although, during all these past years, Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru has been preaching to all countries sermons on the peaceful settlement of disputes.

The People's Republic of China has made a peaceful offer and has, in the interest of an amicable settlement, unilaterally put an end to the fighting. India has, however, refused to accept the offer. This refusal constitutes a flagrant repudiation of India's peaceful posture in international affairs and of the spirit of Nehru's sermons on the virtues of the peaceful settlement of disputes.

Pakistan has a legitimate cause to feel concerned over India's growing military strength and the massive military aid given to India by Pakistan's Western allies. Our own apprehensions apart, in the interest of world peace and especially the peace of this region, we ask the Indian Government to settle its dispute with China through peaceful negotiations on an honourable and equitable basis.

There is nothing so difficult about the present dispute between India and China that it cannot be settled by peaceful means. China contends that it has to rectify its boundary, which is a legacy of British colonial rule. This was admitted by Prime Minister Nehru many years ago in his *Glimpses of World History*. In that book, Nehru said that Imperialism usurped large areas of China. The rectification of the MacMahon Line is a part of the struggle of China to set right the wrongs done to it by colonial powers.

In *Glimpses of World History*, Mr. Nehru has said:

> "Having seen how India was exploited in the nineteenth century by the industrialists and capitalists of Britain, let us go to the other great country of Asia, India's old-time friend, that ancient among nations, China. We shall find here a different type of exploitation by the West." (p. 457).
>
> "The great Chinese Empire of the Manchus, which, by the end of the eighteenth century, covered and dominated nearly half Asia, was now humbled and disgraced. Western Powers from distant Europe had defeated and humiliated it." (p. 465).
>
> "It was extraordinary—this shameless scramble. Of course, China did not enjoy parting with territory or granting concessions. She was forced to agree, on every occasion, by displays of naval force and threats of bombardment. What shall we call this scandalous behaviour? Highway robbery? Brigandage? It is the way of imperialism. Sometimes it

works in secret; sometimes it covers its evil deeds under a cloak of pious sentiment and hypocritical pretence of doing good to others. But in China in 1898 there was no cloak or covering. The naked thing stood out in all its ugliness." (p. 474).

After the departure of the imperialist British, India inherited the border fashioned by them. It is natural that the Chinese should wish to have it rectified. The only proper way to settle the border dispute, in the present world situation, is for India to accept the offer of the People's Republic of China and without any further loss of time to go to the negotiating table.

Since the actual fighting has ceased, India has had time to ponder over the failures of her policy of non-alignment. But Pandit Nehru has behaved about it in his characteristic way. When the situation for India was critical, he almost abandoned neutrality. But when he found an immediate and overwhelming response to his demand for arms from the West, he held back and tried to retrieve part of the lost ground.

The President of Ghana, the Head of an important neutral State, opposed military assistance to India on the ground that it would only serve to aggravate the situation. Objectively speaking, this was a correct stand. India, however, was in no frame of mind to accept an objective assessment. President Nkrumah, in a letter to the Prime Minister of the United Kingdom, had stated that he was "distressed and saddened to hear the report that the British Government will give India every support in her fight against China". This reaction of a neutralist power caused consternation in India.

President Nkrumah's interpretation of the situation was an honest reflection of his neutralism. India's reaction would also have been the same if the dispute had been between two other states. In the existing case, however, India itself was on trial, not only as a neutralist country, but also as a State. For once, India directly had the experience of being sermonised by those not involved in the dispute.

Despite a major reverse in international diplomacy, Pandit Nehru regained sufficient composure to retrieve largely the ground he had lost in maintaining his superficial posture of neutrality. His principal aim in this effort was to maintain his country's friendly relations with the Soviet Union. It did not require any great feat of diplomacy to do so, because the Western donors of military assistance did not demand any drastic change of policy on his part as the price for such assistance. If he had abandoned neutrality, as was earlier indicated, he would have lost the support of the Soviet Union. The Soviet factor was the main motivation behind Pandit Nehru's attempt to maintain the facade of neutrality. At the same time, the Indian Government also tried desperately to foment misunderstanding between the Soviet Union and the People's Republic of China. On 8th November 1962, Pandit Nehru said:

"Russia will continue to be friendly with us and not to do anything injurious to us. I think that they do have friendly feelings for us."

As a corollary to this, on 10th November, Nehru reasserted the policy of non-alignment and said that India would not give it up either out of fear or to oblige vested interests that were opposed to it.

Still, there is questioning among the Indian people about their Government's policy of non-alignment. This mood has been aggravated by the unwillingness of other neutral states to come forward effectively to support India. However, the Indian Prime Minister persists in maintaining the cover of neutrality for three reasons:

(1) it has been demonstrated that the Western Powers are prepared to offer significant aid to India without preconditions;
(2) it has been possible to maintain friendly relations with the Soviet Union which is a vital factor in India's bargaining with the Western Powers; and
(3) Nehru is reluctant to abandon at this stage of his career the policy to which he owes his international image.

Thus India finds itself isolated. It is appalled by that isolation and no less a person than the President of the Republic of India, Dr. Radhakrishnan, is reported to have said: "India, until recently, was living in a world of make-belief." Still Mr. Nehru has not forsaken his claim to neutralism. At the most, his brand of neutralism may now be said to incline towards the right rather than to the left.

One wonders if Mr. Nehru's foreign policy is undergoing a catharsis or a *nemesis*. If it is a catharsis, he may well achieve the greatest diplomatic triumph of his famous career. On the other hand, if it is a *nemesis*, Mr. Nehru will go down in history as a fallen idol. What it will eventually be does not lie entirely in India's control. It will depend very much on the attitude of the Western Powers.

The rush of arms to India contradicts the much publicised thesis of the Harvard intellectuals that in the present state of international affairs and development of military science, the supply to any country of military hardware is an obsolete form of assistance. According to this school of thought, all the emphasis should be placed on economic assistance. Much was made of this thesis during the last Presidential election campaign and after the Kennedy administration came into office. Following this thesis, a qualitative shift was brought about by the liberal wing of the Democratic Party in the thinking of a section of the American intelligentsia. But hard facts of life and not theories alone have to be taken into account in formulating policies. The Kennedy administration has had to reassess the validity of the Harvard thesis in an actual crisis. The importance of military assistance has once again been recognized, and, even at the cost of betraying an ally

like Pakistan, arms aid has been given to India.

As a consequence, India finds itself friendless and so does Pakistan. India, because she has remained neutral, and Pakistan, because she has been wedded to defence alliances. Never before has the wheel of history turned full circle with such vengeance.

Is it not a cruel irony that the two nations of the sub-continent, that have all these years followed diametrically opposite policies, are today so placed that alliance with the West is being advocated in India and neutralism has become the cry in Pakistan? This trend of thinking is the product of an extraordinary and abnormal denouement of events. But so far as we are concerned we cannot base our national policies on considerations arising from sudden developments. They must have a firm and rational foundation. On dispassionate reflection we should realise the danger inherent in an impetuous and precipitate break with the fundamentals of the policy that we have so far followed.

Is the problem so simple that by merely swapping friends we, that is, both India and Pakistan, will find ideal solutions to our respective problems? Can the Kashmir question be solved to our mutual satisfaction by trading horses? Is there not something radically wrong with the situation in which, after fifteen years of independence, both countries are experiencing a sense of disillusionment and frustration over basic aspects of policy, so much so that today we should each like to be in the other's shoes? This curious situation is essentially due to the tension that exists between the two countries.

However, just as we ought to be more cautious in making new friends, our friends ought perhaps to be equally cautious in making new acquaintances. A bird in hand is worth two in the bush. Confidence is built over a period of time and understanding comes with the maturing of relationships and not from considerations of passing expediency.

We have accused our friends of betraying us, the great let-down of contemporary international affairs. Friendship in inter-State relations is not a personal factor; it is entirely impersonal. The Soviet Union has often been admired for remaining steadfast to its friends. This reputation it has long possessed. I am, however, surprised that no one in the House has observed or made any mention of the present Cuban crisis and of how that valiant young revolutionary, Fidel Castro, was misled and let down by a great ally like the Soviet Union.

Cuba has been let down badly. The U.S.S.R. placed missiles in that little country, far from Soviet soil and gave Fidel Castro a false sense of security. When the chips were down, Mr. Khrushchev took away the missiles and sent Mr. Mikoyan instead!

We are passing through a very difficult period of our history. In the pre-

sent critical situation, the difference between a right and false move might well mean the difference between survival and disaster for our nation.

This situation has been ably and courageously handled by our Foreign Minister, Mr. Mohammed Ali, not only here but also in the United Nations. I wish to pay him a tribute for the manner in which he has performed his difficult task. It has indeed been extremely difficult and I, for one, would not wish to change places with him for all the camels in Sind.

The united will of a people is the most powerful weapon in its armoury. That will is tested in crises and it is in a crisis that a nation rises or falls. I have no doubt that we shall be able to stand the test whenever it comes. This nation of a hundred million will respond to the call of duty with all its vigour and vitality. In the name of the people of Pakistan and in the name of the people of Sind, whom I represent in the Government of Pakistan, let me make it clear to the whole world that in the defence of our country we shall, when the occasion demands, be prepared to make every sacrifice, and even lay down our lives. Rejecting the obnoxious colonial categories of martial and non-martial races, I say that if we have to fight for the preservation of the independence of Pakistan, every Pakistani, man and woman will be a soldier. The whole nation will be in arms. If we fight with an indomitable spirit and tenacity, victory will be ours. If we persevere with the same firmness and strength of purpose we shall also be able to liberate Kashmir. The nation, I have no doubt, will rally round its flag and its leader. It will protect our ramparts. If need be, it will move mountains.

The Government of Pakistan appeals to the Government of India to accept the generous offer of the Central Government of the People's Republic of China to negotiate a peaceful settlement of the border conflict. It is incumbent on the parties concerned and on the United Nations, as the arbiter of world peace, to make earnest efforts to settle the Sino-Indian dispute, or else, a blind fate may drive those nations towards self-destruction.

It is for the great men who control the destinies of their peoples, to settle this dispute and all other important disputes according to the principles of justice and equity, so that the people of the world can be enabled to make the fullest use of this age of glorious opportunities.

Statement on the Joint Communique signed by President Ayub Khan and Prime Minister Nehru on 29th November 1962 (1st December 1962)

I seek your permission to make a short statement on the Joint Communique signed by Mr. Jawaharlal Nehru, Prime Minister of India, and Field Marshal Mohammad Ayub Khan, President of Pakistan, on the evening of 29th November 1962, which you, Sir, and Members of the House must have read in yesterday's morning newspapers.

In the recent past, events have moved so dramatically and swiftly, that, at times, it has not been possible to keep pace with them. We are deeply concerned about the recent developments as they affect our relations not only with our neighbours but also with other countries with whom we have close association.

The National Assembly has been convened because of the situation that had arisen out of the Sino-Indian conflict. A crisis was precipitated on our borders and the country was gravely affected by it. It was felt necessary to take into confidence the Members of this Assembly, who are the chosen representatives of the people of Pakistan.

We have had a useful and constructive discussion in the House and the Government has benefited by the different views expressed by its Members. We are happy that we have been able to gauge the sentiments prevailing in the country with regard to the question of Kashmir and its early, honourable and equitable solution.

On our part we have tried to keep the House informed of all the developments, as far as the canons of administrative and diplomatic propriety would permit. But events have moved so fast that it has not been physically possible to keep everyone fully informed of them. Nevertheless, our desire

has been to keep in close touch with the responsible representatives of the people and, in particular, with the leaders of the various groups.

Sir, so far as this Communique is concerned, it was issued after 7.00 p.m. on 29th November. It was the intention of the Government to give the background of this Communique to the House yesterday morning. But, in consultation with the leaders of the various groups, it was agreed, and that was the consensus of opinion, that as the Communique was a very important document, the party leaders needed time to consider it and its implications. You, therefore, adjourned yesterday's sitting to meet again today.

As I have said, because of the rapid march of events, it was not possible to keep the House informed of successive developments. It is known to everyone that when discussions are at a critical or sensitive stage, it is not possible for the Government to reveal every aspect of those discussions. In India, in spite of the existence of a state of emergency and the fact that the Lok Sabha was in session, the Indian Government did not take it into confidence on the contents of the Joint Communique. In such cases, a good deal has to be left unsaid. I hope the House will be satisfied with this explanation. It is the genuine desire of the Government to take the nation into confidence and precisely for this reason the National Assembly has been summoned for this emergency session. We intend to continue to do that through this House so far as that is possible and permissible.

Now, I shall read out the Communique to the House. With your permission, I shall read its text:

> "The President of Pakistan and the Prime Minister of India have agreed that a renewed effort should be made to resolve the outstanding differences between their two countries on Kashmir and other related matters so as to enable India and Pakistan to live side by side in peace and friendship. In consequence, they have decided to start discussions at an early date with the object of reaching an honourable and equitable settlement. These will be held in the initial stage at the Ministerial level. At the appropriate stage, direct talks will be held between Mr. Nehru and President Ayub.
>
> Sd/- JAWAHARLAL NEHRU
> 29-11-1962
> Sd/- MOHAMMAD AYUB KHAN
> 29-11-1962."

This Communique was issued simultaneously in Rawalpindi and New Delhi.

After its release, certain developments took place which have somewhat confused the picture. It is reported that the Prime Minister of India, in his statement in the Lok Sabha, tried to modify, or qualify, the undertaking given

by him in the Communique. I am sure the House has read that statement. I must admit that it caused an electrifying reaction in Pakistan, not only in the Government but in the entire nation. The representatives of the countries that have tried to bring us a little closer to a settlement of our dispute and who were present in Pakistan also reacted rather sharply to this pronouncement of the Prime Minister of India. This is reflected in the statement made by Mr. Averell Harriman, Assistant Secretary of State of the United States and Special Emissary of President Kennedy to India and Pakistan. Mr. Harriman, on reading Mr. Nehru's statement, commented immediately as follows on the night of 30th November:

> "Prime Minister Nehru made it quite clear to Mr. Duncan Sandys and to me that he was prepared to enter into discussions to resolve the differences between India and Pakistan on Kashmir without pre-conditions. I feel sure he intends to carry out this undertaking."

The High Commission for the United Kingdom also issued a statement last night. It says:

> "On arrival at Karachi at 10 o'clock tonight, 30th November, Mr. Duncan Sandys was shown a report of the statement made in the Lok Sabha by Mr. Nehru this morning. In view of the grave reaction to the statement in Pakistan, Mr. Sandys has decided to fly to Delhi immediately, in order to clear up the misunderstanding which, if allowed to persist, might seriously prejudice the coming discussions between India and Pakistan".

As this statement indicates, although Mr. Duncan Sandys, Secretary for Commonwealth Relations in the Government of the United Kingdom, was to leave for London, he changed his schedule and flew back to New Delhi. Arriving there in the early hours of this morning, he issued a statement which has not yet been reported in our Press. I would like to draw the attention of the House, to this statement which was released in New Delhi during the night of 30th November/1st December 1962. It says:

> "When I arrived in Karachi this evening on my way back to London, I was shown a report of a statement made by Mr. Nehru in the Indian Parliament about the forthcoming talks between India and Pakistan. At the same time, I was informed of the grave concern which his statement had evoked in Pakistan. Since I was sure that this had arisen from a misunderstanding, I thought it right to fly at once to Delhi and see Mr. Nehru in order to clear the matter up. As I expected, Mr. Nehru readily assured me that it was incorrect to read into his statement any intention to limit the scope of the discussions or to exclude consideration of any solution which either government might wish to propose."

This morning, it has been reported that after Mr. Duncan Sandys' discussion with the Indian Prime Minister, another statement has been issued,

which reads as follows:

"Mr. Nehru, when asked to comment on the statement made by Mr. Harriman and Mr. Sandys, said:

'The statements correctly represent the position of the Government of India. There has never been any question of pre-conditions on the scope of the talks which the two Governments are initiating. As I indicated yesterday in the Lok Sabha, the problem of Kashmir is complicated and difficult; but I am sure that with goodwill on both sides, it should be possible to work out an honourable and equitable solution of this and other problems'."

This is the statement which is reported to have been issued this morning by the Indian Prime Minister.

Now, Sir, what is important is the fact that the Indian Prime Minister has put his signature on a Communique, which is now a public document for the whole world to see and read, in which he has agreed to discuss the Kashmir problem and to arrive at an honourable and equitable solution of it. That is what is important. That is the crux of the whole transaction. I do not have to explain here that very often when a fixed policy changes, the change is usually not admitted at once. Public opinion has to be considered. We know how strong the feelings are in both countries on this question. I therefore beseech the House through you, Sir, to understand the difficulties of the situation, and not to read too much into what was said by Mr. Nehru in the Lok Sabha.

Sir, in the past we have been trapped, to use a word which may not be very sophisticated but which conveys our meaning. We have also been misled in the past. We are an aggrieved party, an injured party and we are moving with the utmost caution. We should not read more into the situation than it warrants; nor should we like the nation to do so. In good faith, we tried in the past to negotiate a settlement of the Kashmir dispute; but in vain. Now there has neen a certain chain of events, a certain combination of events, which has brought about a radical change in the situation, and once that change has taken place, people have to take cognizance of it, because there is no force, and there is no argument, which is stronger than the compulsion of events. Let us, therefore, be patient and cautious, but let us, at the same time, be determined to approach the problem in a realistic manner.

On account of our cautiousness, it has been decided that the Summit Conference between the Prime Minister of India and our President is to be preceded by Ministerial discussions and negotiations. This is, in itself, an indication that we are not trying to rush things. The very fact that our Government has proposed, and the Government of India has agreed, that Ministerial discussions should first take place, so that the thinking of the

two parties is crystallised so as to lead at least to some tentative formula and thus provide a concrete basis for negotiation, is a proof of our cautiousness. Unless we are convinced of the fact that there is a change of heart and a sincere approach on the part of India, the Summit Conference will not take place.

Now, Sir, I should again like to assure the House that the developments which have culminated in the Joint Communique do not in any way prejudice or jeopardize our relations with any other state. What India and Pakistan have agreed to is to negotiate a peaceful settlement of their outstanding disputes. This is exactly what the People's Republic of China has proposed to India.

I am very thankful to you, Sir, for having given me this opportunity to address the House.

Speech in the National Assembly on December 4, 1962

Sino-Indian Conflict—Western Arms for India—Pacts with the West—Negotiations with India—Relations with China and USSR

This emergency session of the National Assembly of Pakistan was called when the alarming events that have been taking place in our region had reached a critical stage. In calling this session the intention of the Government was to ascertain the views of the representatives of the nation coming from different parts of the country and belonging to different parties.

We have heard with great profit the constructive suggestions that have been made in the course of the debate. We have always been aware of the strong feelings that exist in the country on the question of Kashmir which we regard as the question of questions for Pakistan. We have taken note of the views expressed on the massive arms aid which has come to India as a result of the Sino-Indian border conflict.

As I said in my speech on 26th November, foreign policy is the hallmark of the sovereignty of a nation, a manifestation of its independence. It is indeed the most important and the most sensitive aspect of a country's policy. Foreign policy cannot be subjected to mob rule. It cannot be subjected to the clamour of the street. In formulating foreign policy, the Government has to take into consideration not only the immediate interests of the country but also its long-term interests. Moreover, the Government alone is in possession of all the facts about the developments that are taking place, about the currents and under-currents of international opinion and the changes that are taking place in it. All these are matters that have to be carefully considered in the formulation of the country's foreign policy. In this twentieth century, events move so fast that even in normal times—let alone abnormal times—it is not always possible to take all the honourable members into confidence. This fact is axiomatic. I do not have to dilate

on it. Its validity has been appreciated by the House. At a critical juncture, such as the present one, a decision one way or the other, may make or mar the destiny of our people and our country. Those saddled with responsibility have constantly to bear that in mind.

The National Assembly of Pakistan, having been convened to meet in an emergency session, I would like to assure honourable members that Government has taken them into confidence so far as has been possible and so far as has been necessary. We appreciate their response which, on the whole, has been an understanding and accommodating one.

A serious situation has developed around the sub-continent. It was more serious a few weeks ago than it is today; but the crisis is still with us. Its lingering clouds still cast dark shadows over our horizon. However, at the time when the session was convened, we could not foresee certain developments that have since taken place. We could not, for instance, anticipate the unilateral declaration of a cease-fire by the People's Republic of China, motivated by the highest considerations of peace and goodwill and of the security not only of this area but of the whole world. Nor could we have anticipated certain other events which have logically followed from that cease-fire.

At the time when the conflict on the Chinese border arose, the Government of Pakistan made its own position with regard to it quite clear. We are convinced that the conflict was no more than border warfare, that the war was at best a phantom war and that the only question involved in it was that of the rectification of a boundary which, even Indian leaders some years ago admitted, had been imposed on the People's Republic of China. Sir, the stand taken by the Government of Pakistan has been vindicated by the unilateral declaration of a cease-fire by the People's Republic of China and by the offer of peace made by the Chinese Prime Minister to the Prime Minister of India.

We have done everything in our power to exercise restraint. We have cautioned other countries also to move in the matter in a guarded fashion in order to obviate the recurrence of hostilities and prevent an enlargement of the conflict. But notwithstanding our counsel of caution, certain countries, for reasons of their own, have thought it fit to make a voluntary gift of massive arms to India in order to enable it to carry on the war with the People's Republic of China.

This arms aid given to India by certain Western countries has alarmed us. It is a matter which perturbs the people of Pakistan. If this supply of arms to India is to continue on the present scale, it is bound to aggravate the Sino-Indian dispute and perhaps lead to a more serious situation, escalating into nuclear annihilation. We have the satisfaction that, for our part, we have more than cautioned the Western countries. In their own global

interests, these countries have taken a stand and offered arms assistance to India despite our protests. India is unfortunately trying to take advantage of the situation to obtain arms on a massive scale without regard to the dangerous consequences that will ensue from it. These consequences will be dangerous not only for India but also to the whole of this region. By opening its gates, so to speak, to arms from the United States of America and Great Britain, India is undoubtedly aggravating the situation between itself and the People's Republic of China.

We have been told that India intends to augment its armed forces by no less than 40 per cent of their present strength. Let any objective, impartial observer judge and decide whether such an augmentation is commensurate with India's economic resources, her political viability and her actual defence requirements. To expect India to be able to sustain a force of that size is completely unrealistic. India's attempt to do so will bring about complications not only in India's relations which China but also in her relations with Pakistan and even with the other neighbouring countries.

We are told that this arms assistance is required by India to drive back the Chinese. This is another dangerous thesis. If India attempts to drive back the Chinese in the terrain where the recent conflict took place, where communications are poor in the extreme, that will lead to a situation which will pose a very grave and serious threat to the sub-continent and to Asia as a whole.

In the twentieth century there is no question of thinking in terms of driving any one back by *force*. With the threat of nuclear annihilation ever present in the minds of all sensible people, there is only one proper course of action and that is the resolution of conflicts by peaceful negotiations. Salvation lies in being guided by civilized methods under the umbrella of international law, not by the promptings of impulse or pride or the passions of a newly sovereign people. An attempt by India to drive back the Chinese will lead not only to a full scale conflict between the two sides but also perhaps to a much larger conflict.

We want not only the people of India but also the Western Powers, who, by acting impetuously and playing into India's hands, have failed to recognize the folly of a course of action which might inflict enormous sufferings on the inhabitants of the sub-continent and of the rest of Asia. By now, India should have learnt that it is suicidal to think in terms of an armed conflict with a major Power like the People's Republic of China.

The People's Republic of China is no pimple on the face of India as was little Goa. It is a Colossus. It is a vast indestructible country of 650 million people, united in a common cause and with common ideals for the sake of which they would willingly lay down their lives. It is in the interests of the people of India, of the peoples of the sub-continent and the peoples of our

entire region that India should accept the offer made by the Chinese Prime Minister and go to the negotiating table so that this dispute can be resolved in a manner satisfactory both to China and India.

The real purpose of India wanting to augment its forces recklessly is to build up an army for two fronts, to face the People's Republic of China and to face Pakistan. That is the real purpose of India's request for massive aid. It is for this purpose that India is making a desperate bid to build up its armed forces. We cannot accept this situation with equanimity. That the people of Pakistan are concerned about it has been shown both in this House as well as outside it. I should like to reiterate and re-emphasise to the Western democracies that they should not rush into this dangerous venture, for who knows it might trigger a world war of nuclear annihilation.

What is required is not only peace between China and India but also disengagement of forces between India and Pakistan. This disengagement can only be brought about if the explosive question of Kashmir is settled on an honourable and equitable basis. As far as Pakistan is concerned, we have always said that we were willing to have such a settlement of this issue.

Now, the recent events, dramatic and critical as they have been, have led to the release of a Joint Communique by the Prime Minister of India and the President of Pakistan. This Communique has been the subject of considerable debate in the House. A few days ago, I made a statement with regard to it. I should like to say that we all know that the problem of Kashmir is a tangled one and in it are involved the prestige and the passions of the two nations of this sub-continent. But to solve this complex problem, which has defied solution during the last fifteen painful years, we need to separate passion from policy and pride from the pursuit of a solution. The Joint Communique breaks the agonising stalemate.

It has been said that the Joint Communique was actually a conspiracy, of which we have been the victim; that what India wants is to gain time; that India is not anxious to settle the problem; that India considers her occupation of Kashmir as a settled fact; and that constitutionally and politically it regards Kashmir to be an integral and inseparable part of India. All these arguments have been advanced on the floor of the House. If one were to accept them, it would follow that the Joint Communique is actually a deception and a fraud and that we should not have agreed to it. Actually these arguments demonstrate the value of the Joint Communique, for the Communique marks a manifest departure from the position that Kashmir is a dead issue and establishes that it is a live issue and that it is recognized to be such by the Prime Minister of India, after fifteen years of denial of it by him.

Now, let us be realistic. We know that this problem has been frozen or

attempts have been made to freeze it. Let us also admit that in regard to it positions have hardened in both countries. The Joint Communique has at least changed that situation. In that sense, we have moved forward.

As I said the other day, when a departure takes place from hardened positions, we have to be a little patient and in all fairness we have to create a new climate, such as will generate goodwill on both sides. Without that, however strong the compulsion of events, or the force of circumstances or other good reasons for it, there can be no genuine attempt at negotiation. Therefore, before we enter into the talks and begin negotiations, we have to assume that there is a goodwill and a desire on the part of the other side to settle this problem.

If, on the other hand, we are sceptical and begin with a defeatist attitude, then nothing is going to happen. There will not be a single step forward. If there is to be no step forward, I am afraid, no government will be able to settle this problem.

We are not capable of any miracles. However, we are as patriotic as the Opposition. A mere line divides us from them in this House. It is not true or fair to say that we are devoid of patriotism; that we do not feel as strongly on this issue as they do. As I have said, there is only a line dividing them from us; and that dividing line does not give them a monopoly of patriotism, nor are they the exclusive repository of all the wisdom in the land. They are a minority with a majority complex. They should realise that we are as anxious and determined as they are to see an end to the problem of Kashmir.

We are happy that the agonising stalemate is broken and that some progress has been achieved. It may be that disillusionment awaits us. I admit that we have been disillusioned in the past. Every school boy on Pakistan— knows how generous we have been, how much confidence we have reposed in our adversaries and how on each occasion we were deceived. We know this but I think that with that experience, and notwithstanding the bitterness of the past, we shall be in a better postion to enter into these talks. Besides, by entering into them, we are giving away nothing. On the contrary, we are gaining something.

Now, I return to the Joint Communique. It states: "The President of Pakistan and the Prime Minister of India have agreed that a renewed effort should be made to resolve the outstanding differences between their two countries on Kashmir and other related matters." The words "related matters" are particularly important. I do not want to go into details, as that might affect the atmosphere we are trying to create, a better atmosphere, shorn of the hatred and bitterness of the past. I would, therefore, not like to go into an explanation of "other related matters". But do consider the significance of these words. When the Opposition demands that we should have made this or that condition, they should take into consideration the

words "other related matters."

There is some contradiction in the approach of the members of the Opposition. On the one hand, their demand is: Fix a time-table and set a time-limit so that India does not procrastinate or get time to consolidate its position further in Kashmir. On the other hand, instead of "other related matters", they have suggested a catalogue of "other matters", to discuss which an inordinate amount of time would be required. The other matters they have suggested are no doubt important but, in the context of Kashmir, they are relatively not such. The members of the Opposition demand a speedy conclusion of the Kashmir negotiations, and yet they put forward a catalogue of other issues and say these too should be the subject of discussion. Sir, they approbate and reprobate with astonishing inconsistency and speed.

I submit for the consideration of this House and for the consideration of the people of Pakistan that we should not take a negative attitude. Our efforts should not be counter-productive. We lose nothing by welcoming this latest development of events. We do not endanger our relations with other countries, to which matter I shall later revert. As a point of departure from our old relations with India, we should welcome the present development.

It has also been said by the members of the Opposition that we cannot barter away the interests and wishes of the people of Kashmir, that the people of Kashmir should not only have been consulted but should also have taken part in the negotiations. I appeal to their good sense and ask how such an arrangement could have been constitutionally possible. The very fact that it is the question of Kashmir, which I have called "the question of questions for Pakistan", which comes in the way of normal and friendly relations between Pakistan and India, shows how deep and lasting is our concern for the people of Kashmir. We cannot talk of Kashmir in the abstract. The very fact that we demand a solution in Kashmir means that we are taking into consideration the legitimate aspirations and sufferings of the great and heroic people of Kashmir.

It has also been said that these negotiations should not be entered into because that somehow or the other bypasses the United Nations or weakens our position in the United Nations. This is an argument which I cannot understand.

I should like to refer you to an Article of the United Nations Charter, namely Article 33, Chapter VI, which states:

"1. The parties to any dispute, the continuance of which is likely to endanger the maintenance of international peace and security, shall, first of all, seek a solution by negotiation, enquiry, mediation, conciliation, arbitration, judicial settlement, resort to regional agencies or arrangements, or other peaceful means of their own choice.

"2. The Security Council shall, when it deems necessary, call upon the parties to settle their dispute by such means."

Now, if one were to go through the important resolutions of the United Nations and the recommendations of its representatives, it would be found that time and again it was suggested that the parties to the dispute, *i.e.*, Pakistan and India, should resort to "negotiations". This was the recommendation of Dr. Frank Graham and of others who dealt with the Kashmir problem.

Let us leave aside the much maligned Western democracies, who have always lent their complete support to us in the Security Council. Let us leave them aside for the moment. Even the Soviet Union has suggested to Pakistan and India that the best way to solve the Kashmir problem is by entering into negotiations. Such bilateral negotiations have been suggested not only by the Soviet Union, but by all other important Communist countries. They have been suggested by neutralist countries as well. When I went to Cairo, just before the last Security Council meeting on Kashmir, President Gamal Nasser told me that the best way to solve the Kashmir dispute was first of all to exhaust all the possibilities of bilateral negotiations between India and Pakistan. The same suggestion was made by Ghana and Ireland, and by several other members of the United Nations.

Therefore, by entering into negotiations, we are in no way jeopardizing our position in the United Nations; we are in no way departing from our stand in the United Nations. We are not compromising or prejudicing our position in that world forum. If at any time the negotiations should become infructuous, we would be free to go to the United Nations, and to go to that Organization with our hands strengthened. We could then tell the United Nations that we had more than exhausted the provisions of Article 33 of the Charter. I repeat that the present developments strengthen our position in the United Nations rather than weaken it.

I have always been a great believer in the United Nations, and I still believe that it has come to play an important and decisive role as an instrument of peace in the world. We, the peoples of the smaller countries, in particular, must see to it that the United Nations is strengthened. Pakistan's policy has always been to lend complete support to all United Nations resolutions and to strengthen the United Nations and all its organs. But in regard to the Kashmir problem, there is a contradiction in our approach to the United Nations. When we go to the United Nations, there is cynicism. We are asked: What will the United Nations do? What has the United Nations done? Why repose confidence in it? How long are you going to keep this problem shelved by taking it to the United Nations? Thus, when Government activates the problem in the United Nations, there is a feeling of frustration in the country. People think that the United Nations is subject

to big Power pressure and because of the veto, nothing fruitful will emerge from it. That is the attitude when we go to the United Nations.

When we agree to bilateral talks, we are told with brazen inconsistency that, the Security Council being seized with the case, the talks will jeopardize our position in the United Nations. What then should the Government do? I should also like to submit that when, after a discussion in the Security Council, the veto has been applied, the sequel must necessarily be a dialogue between the parties. When the two parties disagree, the veto thwarts all positive approaches. Some scountries upport India, others support Pakistan. Any resolution that is tabled is subject to the veto. If the veto rules out mediation or arbitration, we have no option but to exhaust the procedure of bilateral talks.

We have been reminded of the two resolutions of the United Nations Commission for India and Pakistan, namely those of 13th August, 1948, and 5th January, 1949, respectively. These resolutions are there. They call for a plebiscite preceded by demilitarisation. We have had debates for a number of years on the question of the implementation of these resolutions. When any proposal is made to facilitate their implementation, it becomes subject to the veto.

Although negotiation is the only proper course at a certain stage, and in a certain phase of a dispute, yet we find that it has become suspect. It is felt that it is dangerous. What is really unusual about our willingness to talk? Even the United States and the U.S.S.R., in spite of the United Nations and in spite of so many other avenues of getting together, have had, on a number of important occasions, direct negotiations, the most recent ones being when President Kennedy, after his election, met Premier Khrushchev in Vienna. Nobody expected that all the problems of the world would be solved through them, that there would be complete and general disarmament, that the question of Berlin would be settled and that the Soviet Union and the United States of America would begin to live in eternal comradeship. Nobody expected sr ch results. But that did not preclude the two Heads of States from meeting.

No responsible government should be prevented from making efforts to narrow down its differences with other governments. By negotiation one does not lose anything. Direct action today might lead to a complete destruction of our cities, our homes and mosques. We must not put our country into jeopardy. I have confidence in the people of Pakistan, and I know that they are capable of the greatest courage and of the greatest sacrifices. But we should not be told by future generations that we were irresponsible, that we unnecessarily led the country into the kind of action which a Chenghiz Khan might take. That would be the result of direct action!

It has been said that there should have been pre-conditions to the negotiations. Why should there be pre-conditions. Our case is known to the whole world, and is known in every home, in every village and town in Pakistan. We have repeatedly and solemnly stated it. Our case is known to the other side, as their's is known to us. We are entering into negotiations with our case fully explained and known to the whole world.

What is the meaning of a dispute? What is the definition of a dispute? In a dispute there is a claim and a counter-claim. When you enter into negotiations for the settlement of a dispute, your claim is known to the other side and the claim of the other side is known to you. Thus the parties know what the subject of negotiation is. There can, therefore, be no question of pre-conditions.

I would not like to say any more about the Joint Communique. We are going through a difficult and perilous period. In the crucial days ahead we should speak with a united voice. Our endeavour should be to create an atmosphere of goodwill and understanding such as will be conducive to a settlement. We shall enter into the negotiations with full knowledge of our past experience. What is the object of the Ministerial level meeting in the first instance? If we come to know that there is on the other side no good will and no intention to tackle the problem in a realistic manner and to find an equitable and honourable solution of it, then the Summit Conference will, I think, be unnecessary. In the meantime, our vigilance has to be maintained and we should be prepared for all eventualities.

In the past, although the odds have been against us, India being the larger country, with greater resources, we have, nevertheless, shown that we have the capability and the courage to meet eventualities, which might endanger our national life and security. When I say that we should maintain our vigilance, I mean vigilance over every part of Pakistan. The territory of East Pakistan is as sacred to us as that of West Pakistan. There can be no real defence of Pakistan without proper safeguard of the frontiers of East Pakistan. The defence of East Pakistan is, in a sense, even more vital than that of West Pakistan. The defence forces of East Pakistan are to be augmented and strengthened especially in the light of the present developments. I should like to inform the House that a new reoriented look is being given to the problems of East Pakistan and its defence requirements.

The Government understands the disappointment of the House and of the people of Pakistan in regard to our membership of the defence Pacts. We had thought that the Pacts would serve a useful purpose. But in the cold ruthlessness of international politics, we cannot expect a perfect alliance or a state of relations which would be ideal from our point of view alone. Such an expectation would be divorced from reality. Nevertheless, I recognize that we have been disappointed by the half-hearted and some-

times lukewarm support we have received from those who are members of the defence alliances with which we are associated and from whom we expected substantial support in our difficulties.

I must state here that we shall not hesitate for a moment to withdraw from these Pacts, if and when Pakistan's interests so demand. We entered into them to promote the interests of Pakistan and its people. If those interests are not promoted, if they are not safeguarded by the Pacts, then let it be known that we shall withdraw from them and adopt a policy which will promote and safeguard the highest interests of the people of Pakistan and its security.

The criticism to which the Pacts have been subjected in this debate reminds me of the reply which Socrates gave to one of his pupils, who had reported to him that a certain individual had been abusing the philosopher. Socrates said that he could not believe it and added: "It is impossible that the person you mention should abuse me. I have done him no favour. I have never obliged him. Why should he find fault with me?" The Pacts are there. We are critical of them.

The fact is that as defensive arrangements they have not been altogether without value to us. They have had their meaning in the larger context of things and they have served their purpose. In the present circumstances, in the present denouncement of events, let me tell the people of Pakistan and their leaders that we cannot permit ourselves to lapse into the coma of isolation. It was in such state of isolation that we became the victim of aggression—aggression which snatched away Junagadh, Manavadar and Kashmir from us.

I should like to make it clear beyond all doubt that we have friendly relations with the People's Republic of China and that nothing will be permitted in any way to endanger those relations. Our relations with China are an independent factor in our foreign policy and not contingent on any other. This has been made clear to the House. We shall see to it that, as events unfold, our point of view and our position are explained to and understood by the Chinese Government. That is our duty and we shall discharge it. In the best interests of Pakistan, we shall maintain the spirit of goodwill, friendship and cordiality with the great People's Republic of China.

Similarly, it will be our endeavour to maintain good relations also with the Union of Socialist Soviet Republics. The present Government and the predecessor Government achieved some degree of normalization of relations with the Soviet Union by entering into an oil agreement with that country. We shall welcome further co-operation with it in the economic and other beneficial fields, co-operation which may be of mutual interest to the Soviet Union and to Pakistan.

In conclusion, I would say again that the Government has benefited

greatly from the discussion that has taken place in this House. We have taken into consideration the views expressed by its members, representing various shades of opinion. For our part, we have, as far as possible, taken them into confidence in respect of all developments.

I shall be expressing the sentiment shared by all sections of this House when I say that after the dust of this debate has settled down, it will be found that we stand united on many matters. We do believe that India and the People's Republic of China should settle their conflict in a peaceful manner. This is the only honourable way in which they can come to terms. India should accept the offer of negotiations made by the Prime Minister of China. We believe that Pakistan's friendship with China is a growing factor in our foreign policy and that it does not depend on any other factor. We believe in the normalization of relations with the Soviet Union and with other states, in particular with the Muslim countries, and not excluding the neutral countries. With many of these countries, we have a host of affinities. We are thankful to Turkey and other countries which have taken up a constructive attitude in the present Sino-Indian conflict.

We feel that the Western Powers have disappointed us. We have cause to feel this disappointment because we are gravely concerned about the rush of arms to India. Nevertheless, we assure them that our relations with them will remain steadfast, *provided* they appreciate Pakistan's position and recognize its point of view that the arms assistance to India must inevitably pose a very serious threat to the entire sub-continent.

Finally, we believe that nothing will be lost if we promptly enter into negotiations with India. We should, of course, be every cautious and should bear in mind the difficulties that we have encountered in the past negotiations. Let us make this last attempt. It will enable us to find out whether there has been any growth of goodwill for us in India and whether circumstances have led it to realize that good relations are in the best interest of both our countries.

These negotiations will, in no way, prejudice or jeopardize our stand in the United Nations. On these issues, I think, there can be no difference of opinion amongst us. It is not a question of the personal satisfaction of individuals. It is the question of the future of Pakistan. It is the question of the future of our people.

Pakistan was created by a great man. To preserve it, we shall make every sacrifice in the way in which Pakistanis are known to make sacrifices. I appeal to all to speak with one voice and tell the world that Pakistan stands united and will not surrender on any vital issue. I pledge my word that we shall persevere in the cause of Kashmir, and shall never abandon it. We want a peaceful settlement of all disputes. We shall stand by this principle.

Speech in the National Assembly on April 13, 1963

National Unity—Parity in the Services

I have heard with considerable attention and interest the speech of Mr. Mahbubul Huq. Although the intentions and the purposes may be different, I think the objectives are salutary and we all agree with the objectives that he has enunciated. Moreover, we may not agree with the method because what is important is not the means but the end that we seek to achieve; and from that point of view, I think, with a little bit of adjustment we can discuss this matter. As pointed out we can achieve this important and noble objective of bringing about the solidarity and greater unity of our country. Sir, very often one thinks that national unity can be achieved by issuing an edict. This is not possible. Nor it is possible to achieve national unity and national cohesion by making political statements or by trying to exploit a situation. The process of evolution of a people is a long drawn process. There are differences in peoples' history, in peoples' values, in their languages, in their cultures and we are fortunate in Pakistan that in spite of these differences there is a great and imperishable bond of our faith and ideology that unites us, but let us not put complete and total credence on this very vital aspect alone. There are many other important and contributing factors which are necessary for national development. In an under-developed region in which communications are poor and where regions are one thousand miles apart from each other, the differences acquire considerable meaning; and in order to bridge the gap and in order to reduce the disharmonies, it is necessary to have a spirit of understanding. It is necessary to have a liberal approach and not a dogmatic or a firm and one-sided outlook. On such matters patience is required and a common understanding is required. When there are differences these differences

should be appreciated rather than ridiculed.

Now, Sir, how does national cohesion come about. A people unite, a people get together, when there is an external threat or an external pressure. This unphysiological term is called the ethnocentric mentality. This is the mentality when there is pressure or when there is fear from outside. A people, whether knit by a racial sect or by a national spirit bring about a greater cohesion and greater solidarity among themselves. This is one aspect of national cohesion. At present Pakistan faces an external threat. This external menace is more than many other threats and this in itself is a factor towards national evolution. There is another important contribution towards the national cohesion and that is in a time of actual conflict, in a time when people are called to make sacrifices, in a time when they stand shoulder to shoulder when they are in the war trenches fighting against common enemies and fighting for great and glorious cause. There is a need for affinity which occurs among many peoples of many nationalities. Therefore, you will find that situations of war themselves create sometimes this great national cohesio n and solidarity. In revolutionary conditions, it is the revolutionary forces which suffer a common cause, which go through turmoil which go through sacrifices and by those sacrifices and these turmoils they get closer to one another. In that respect Pakistan had no experience of that situation, because it is a most horrifying experience. So, it is said that certain people are very patriotic than others. This is, I am afraid, a most unfortunate observation. Patriotism does not grow on the trees. Patriotism is not a birthright. People are not born with the patriotic spirit. That has to be inculcated in the people. Patriotism is something which is to be taught to people from the time they go to school, from the time they go to the nurseries. It is a process which starts in the schools. It is a process that starts when a child starts having certain ideas and that is the important aspect of the problem to which attention has to be given. It is not possible to accept that a person is born with a patriotic birthright. Moreover, Sir, patriotism comes out of a pride of participation. Patriotism comes in the sensation of taking decisions for your country and for your people. One of the causes and one of the reasons why people crave for independence, and why they make sacrifices in order to be free, is that they themselves must be partners and associates in taking decisions for their people and for their country. If there is an approach of an exclusive attitude; if there is an approach of a master race, of a people in a given society who are better endowed than others; if there is a feeling of superiority and inferiority, then that nationalism, and that patriotism, can never grow. If there is a feeling that certain people be regarded as Red Indians, then that patriotism can never grow within a given complex of society. And for that reason, Sir, it is essential to make sacrifices

by those who are in a position to make sacrifices, who are more opulent, who are better educated. After all, Sir, talent, education, and a degree of competence are all relative terms. They are not complete and absolute terms. For instance, suppose the Germans were to claim that they are the most talented race in Europe; that because of their talent, because of their ability, they should dominate the whole of Europe—or even that Prussians should, within Germany, dominate the whole of Germany—then patriotism cannot grow, and patriotism cannot flourish. It is when each region, each people, with their differences of outlook and approach, with their differences of culture and language, are brought about on a common platform, are brought about in a common understanding, when they are as responsible for national decisions and national destinies, then only national unity can be achieved.

(*Interruptions*)

So, Sir, from this point of view what is essential is not only to achieve *parity in the Services* or in the other spheres of national life. What is necessary is to have a participation of the whole of the people of Pakistan at various levels, and in this respect, even if there is disparity in the sense that certain regions or a certain province should have more than the other, that is more important from the point of view of national cohesion than maintaining an Augustine formula for the development of national cohesion. What is important is an objective outlook, a realization that, even if certain people are regarded as less competent, they should share in the development of the nation; that they should rejoice and have the sense of knowing that they too were responsible for the development that took place, and that they were not only the beneficiaries of the development. It is not enough to be merely a beneficiary of a decision, or to be a beneficiary of a certain improved situation. It is more important to take part in the decision which brings about that result, and from that point of view I think it is absolutely vital that all regions of Pakistan, whether they be in East Pakistan or in West Pakistan, but also within West Pakistan itself, must contribute towards this greater comradeship and towards this greater common feeling, and from that point of view I agree with my friend. But, Sir, it is not so simple a task that, by forming a commission, we can achieve the results. The task is in the mind, Sir. The task is in the outlook, in the approach, in the values. We can have one report after another, we can have one commission after another; but if there is no change of outlook, if there is not a broad mind and a broad heart which can bring about these results, then I am afraid no commissions, whether they come from this House or from any other expert body, are going to achieve the results. Therefore, Sir, I would tell my friend that this is not the way to bring about this approach

or the realization, but to bring about a change in the outlook, to bring about a change in the thinking, in the feelings, we should regard each and every part of Pakistan to be similar and identical and equal, and not to think that, because there are differences, one is inferior and the other is superior.

Speech in the National Assembly on April 17, 1963

Democracy—British Parliamentary System—American Revolution—Ebdoed People—Idol Worship—Constitutional Problem—Reign of Terror

Mr. Speaker, Sir, I had not intended to take part in this debate for a variety of reasons. However, the debate on this subject has reached such a nemesis and the poison that it has spread for counter provocative purpose has been so alarming, the distortion of truths, the use of half truths and the slander used is so complete and with such exaggerated venom that I am constrained to take part in this debate not in order to take up cudgels in the vendetta of words and in the Machiavellian mischief that has been done throughout this debate, but to try, in my own way, to tell my friends that there comes a time when we should cry halt to hostility, there comes a time when the people must settle down to basic problems of bringing about a better life or rule for their people, there comes a time when controversies and futile disputes must come to an end in the larger interests of the country. But, alas, Sir, in this tussle of words, in an insatiable desire to wreak vengeance for a purposeless mission, one fails to see what is the object. How are the higher and greater interests of one hundred million people of Pakistan being enhanced or safeguarded? Sir, it has been said here on the floor of the House that democracy, no matter how you define it, no matter how you play with words, does not exist in the land and to establish it the most scathing and bitter criticism has been made against the Government, against the present regime right from the level of the Ministers up to that of the President of the State. I think, Sir, this in itself is a demonstration that democracy does exist in the land, and that there are people who have the courage and I respect them for their courage, who have guts to speak out what they think, however distorted or wrong their impression may be. In the not very long and chequered history of Pakistan, I think moments

have been rare in the last 15 years when people gave vent to their fury so much against the system and against the people and against their own leaders. Sir, ours is not a complete democracy, and I think to achieve complete democracy sacrifices have to be made. In any country where the system of democracy exists there have been sacrifices. If we were to take into consideration the British Parliamentary system we know the amount of sacrifices that were entailed on the British people to attain a measure of free and relatively complete democracy. In the Revolution of 1688, in the struggle against Cromwell, are some of the sacrifices the people had to go through in order to get what they regarded to be a truer form of democracy. France is supposed to have given birth to the doctrine of equality, liberty and fraternity. In the Revolution they chopped off the heads of the people and the leaders' heads were chopped off as well and also of those that followed them in the name of democracy. Napoleon was followed by the Bourbans who were followed by another Napoleon. It is, therefore, through sacrifices that people attain democracy. It is through a process of understanding and of mutual accommodation and mutual conflict that democracy spreads its teaching throughout the land of a people.

Take the case of the American Revolution where also democracy was achieved but it was not achieved easily. Leaders like Washington could not bring about complete democracy. A civil war had to be waged. In this way through different difficult processes democracy was achieved. Freedom cannot be granted. Freedom has to be brought about by the combined efforts of the people and by combination of the talents, not by a division of one power against another power. That tussle destroys the very cream of society. It is a futile endeavour. The tussle which has been displayed in the history of Pakistan during the last 15 years has brought about frustration to the people, and ill-will to the people. I say, Sir, that with the present process of evolution and with this process of democratization, Pakistan will have more democracy than it had before.

Sir, against the EBDOed people we have no rancour or ill-will. They had their days of glory, they had their liberty to exercise their power and they had an opportunity to give their mettle to the people and to give them the best they had.

Sir, must the process be reversed? Must we return to the rule of the coterie? We are called the ruling junta. We are told that this Government in which a handful of people have seized power is undemocratic. Sir, I declare that in the last decade the coterie rule was so narrow that it regarded all others as interlopers.

Sir, glaring tales of the regime have been recounted and, in contrast we have been reminded of the great role the former politicians played in the emancipation of our society. It has also been stated that they shall always

remain the heroes of the country. If they will remain the heroes of the country always, then, Sir, time is there in its fullest abundance for them to stage their come back when the opportunity comes. And that is the process of election. If they have not lost their influence, if they have not lost the people's confidence, they will stage a come back. There will be no suppression.

But can a leader remain a hero for all times? History has shown that a man worshipped one day becomes a villain the next day. Joseph Stalin, who at one time was the iron man of Russia, who was responsible for consolidating the people's revolution, was, according to the estimation of his own people a villain who had lost touch with the people and their problems. Today his memory even is victimised. Sir, we know of happenings in Yugoslavia. We know of the case of China. Chiang Kai Shek who at one time won laurels of the people and who worked side by side with Dr. Sun Yet Sen has been shunted out from the mainland of China and is now in Formosa. There may be one individual or one category of politicians in Pakistan who might have rendered services to Pakistan at one time but, Sir, now they have lost the confidence of the people.

(*Interruption*)

Our religion enjoins on us not to worship idols and, Sir, history has called the march of Islam as the movement against the idolators. We are known as iconoclasts but in our own country we have said how in practice there is idol worship. Liaquat Ali Khan, who was the leader of millions, was our first Prime Minister of Pakistan. He tried to serve the regime in the midst of trying and harrowing circumstances. He faced the mightiest refugee problem. It is he who had to face the isolation of Pakistan by our enemies. Sir, you know the movement against him by a coterie of people,

(*Interruptions*)

You also know, Sir, how certain newspapers carried on a crusade against him but, Sir, that same Liaquat after he was murdered became the idol of the people and he was given the title of Quaid-e-Millat.

Then, Sir, we come to the regime of Khawaja Nazimuddin. At that time that poor old man, that goody goody man, was responsible for giving Pakistan the Basic Principles Committee Report which is regarded as an interesting document.

When we come to the regime of Khwaja Nazimuddin, I have already told the House the amount of opposition given to the Basic Principles Committee Report. The same coterie dislodged him and then, Sir, Nazimuddin becomes a good man, a religious man, a pious man.

Then, Sir, we come to the regime of Muhammd Ali of Bogra. He is

dead and, therefore, I would not like to mention the manner in which he was maligned, the manner in which he was treated, the manner in which he was imported, we may call it on OGL; but imported by the same coterie.

(*Interruptions*)

Then again after Mr. Muhammad Ali a man called Chowdhury Muhammad Ali came into power. He was described a bureaucrat trying to become the Prime Minister, a man who rises from bureaucracy and becomes the Prime Minister. Then again the same coterie replaced him and brought in Mr. Husain Shaheed Suhrawardy. He was given eleven months' time. The same clique promised him support if he espoused the cause of the coterie. They flattened him. He was also flushed out. So, one after another they come and go and they go in a merry-go-round fashion.

Sir, this is the legacy of the last ten years. This is a legacy in which the sufferings and miseries of the people multiplied.

Some of the problems were unnecessarily created, because the coterie must be kept amused at the cost of the people. They must perform a surgical operation so that they can get some flesh. In their first operation they brought about the separation of Karachi from Sind.

(*Interruptions*)

Now, Sir, you look at it in retrospect. Was it not undesirable? The manner in which it was brought about was even more questionable. The people concerned were not consulted. The then Interior Minister with his obsession for the separation of Karachi from Sind created the first stream of animosity amongst brothers, those very same brothers who had welcomed the refugees, who had thrown open their houses to them. This harmony was not appreciated by these people who did not like tranquillity, who did not like order. So a situation was created whereby Karachi had to be separated from Sind without reference to the people of Sind.

(*Interruptions*)

Then, Sir, the constitutional problem. This constitutional problem was created in order to perpetuate the power of the coterie. As a general rule all our basic problems arise due to this problem of constitution. If a Constitution had been framed under the Quaid-i-Azam or under the Quaid-i-Millat I tell you whatever the result, whatever the outcome, the Constitution would have been accepted by the people of Pakistan whether there was a Unitary form of Government or a Federal form of Government or a Parliamentary form of Government or Presidential form of Government; whether it had been based on parity or on population basis; why not on population basis? We have full trust in our brothers of East

Pakistan. It is the coterie who gave us the formula of distrust. They brought this formula. Because of a morbid formula and morbid machinations that they perpetrated we got suspicion; we got confusion; brother was pitched against brother, province was pitched against province, wing was pitched against wing. This is the leadership that they gave to the people of Pakistan.

Sir, the blackest spot in this black record of oppression of this reign of tyranny came in 1954, at a time when the One Unit proposal had been brought before the nation. At that time, Sir, there the most loathsum reign of gangsterism unleashed on the poor people of Sind. At that time there was a scheme of "Sarkari Salar" to rule the country right from Thatta to Tharparkar and from Jacobabad to Dadu. We have heard of Nuremberg. We have been told that this Government has behaved in a similar manner. Sir, this is most uncharitable and most unfair. The people who hear the radio, who read the vernacular papers, the Sindhi papers, the Bengali papers and other papers do not know what happened during the time of Nazi Regime. In Germany many atrocious acts were committed and innocent people were destroyed and butchered. Has it been forgotten that Nazi Germany seized the whole of Western Europe and destroyed the cities of great importance and of great magnitude. They destroyed world peace and world order and that we are being told that there is a Nazi type of regime now in power in Pakistan? But Nazism existed in Pakistan in 1954. The selfrespect of people was bartered away in that one year. We found a reign of terror. There was a mobile van at that time; there were three persons in it, a judge whose career as an officer was despicable, a policeman and a prosecutor. They were going about in a mobile van with warrants of arrest. What did they do? They filled the name of a person in a blank warrant; the judge tried; the policeman brought the victim and the prosecutor made out the case and the victims were put behind the bars. We are accused of favouritism. Does it lie in the mouth of those who created favouritism to say this? How they helped their brothers-in-law, sons-in-law and sisters and servants is known to all.

(*Interruption*)

I charge them for having bartered away the rights of my people. I charge them for having confiscated the right of my people. I charge them for perpetuating the reign of tyranny and misery on my people. The same people are sitting here and accusing this Government.

Speech in the National Assembly on June 11, 1963

Eviction of Muslims from Assam and Tripura

Sir,

The speeches made this afternoon have been repetitious of what was said in the Dacca session, and although the speeches have been equally emotional, Government have been advised to make a clear and positive statement devoid of emotion. I would like to accede to the request of the Honourable members and try to make a factual statement on this difficult and delicate problem.

Sir, the question of eviction of Muslims from the two Indian states is an old one, and also in a sense a new one. It is old in the sense that ever since provincial autonomy was established in the sub-continent there were movements, and also certain political objectives of certain organizations, to clear the Muslims from the States of Assam and Tripura. However, at that time the movement had not gathered momentum and the magnitude which it has now reached. This is an unfortunate episode of the partition of the sub-continent. It is admitted that since June, 1962. it has reached a proportion which cannot be looked at with toleration because it threatens the economy of Pakistan, and cordial and good relations between the two neighbouring countries.

According to the official figures the persons registered as deportees from the two states are as follows:

In Tripura 19,652 persons; and
In Assam 9,349.

These are the registered figures since the new planned movement of evicting Muslims from these two Indian states began.

There are, I believe, higher figures; but these are the registered figures. What is more regrettable is the fact that these helpless citizens of India are

being driven out of the two states by Indian armed forces in order to achieve an objective which is in itself undesirable and invidious, and which is contrary to all canons of international law, morality and custom.

There are two points of view on this subject. Our contention is that these people are Indian, they have always been residents of these two states from time immemorial, and they have a right to live in the country of their birth and origin. On the other hand, the Government of India contends these evictees are not Indian nationals, they have migrated from East Pakistan into the two states, and as such they cannot remain in Assam and Tripura.

For the sake of argument let us assume that the Indian argument is correct. Even if it is correct these people should not be thrown out of the soil of India with the help of the Indian army. This is not the way in which civilized states claiming to be wedded to peace and the use of peaceful policies should behave.

But the Constitution of India in Part II para (5) states: "any person who is domiciled in the territory of India and who has been a resident in the territory of India for not less than 5 years immediately preceding the commencement of the Constitution (*i.e.*, resident in India since 1945) shall be a citizen of India." Now, in order to establish a person as an infiltrator, the onus of proving that the person concerned entered India after 1945 is on the Government of India. Moreover, in the Indo-Pakistan Passport Agreement all Indian/Pakistani residents in the territory of the other had to obtain passports by the 30th of June 1957. Therefore, the Muslim residents in India who did not obtain Pakistan passports by that date cannot be considered Pakistan nationals. Attention in this connection is also invited to sub-paras 10(1), 10(4) and 10(5) of the Indian Citizenship Act 1955. It will be seen therefrom that before a person can be deprived of citizenship, a Committee of Enquiry has to be appointed to go into the question.

It would, therfore, be seen that these evictions are against all canons of international law, and also against the Indian Constitution. They are also against the specific agreement entered into by India and Pakistan, which lays down a procedure for determining the citizenship of a national or a resident of a border territory. The Indian Citizenship Act itself lays down a specific procedure for determining nationality. It stipulates that in the case of doubt you cannot arbitrarily determine the nationality of a person, but must set up a Committee of Enquiry to establish whether he is a citizen or not.

So the Indian contention is contrary to their own laws, to their own Constitution, and is also contrary to international law. Since India is a member of the United Nations, it must comply with international law; and should not apply force in driving out innocent and helpless residents

of its own country for parochial objectives. We contend that these individuals have not infiltrated into India and that they are residents of India. If the Government of India does not agree with this contention, it must establish a Joint Commission to determine the nationality of these residents, and until a Joint Commission is set up to determine the nationality of these individuals by concrete proof and judicial evidence no eviction should take place.

We have protested to the Government of India against its inhuman policy. We launched a protest through the High Commissioner of Pakistan in India on 28 June 1962. An assurance was given by the Indian Prime Minister through our High Commissioner that evictions would be stopped on that very day. Thereafter, Mr. Lal Bahadur Shastri said on 13 August in the Rajia Sabha that eviction of infiltrants from Tripura had been suspended for the time being on human consideration and to reduce tension in the border areas. Please note that the Prime Minister of India on 28 June assured our High Commissioner that they would stop evictions, and this was confirmed by the Indian Home Minister in the Upper House of the Indian Parliament on the 13th of August. Yet on 17 August our High Commissioner was summoned by the Commonwealth Secretary of the Indian Foreign Office and told that India could never accept illegal entrants to be allowed to remain in Indian territory, and evictions must therefore take place. After the categorical assurance given by the Prime Minister on 28 June and by the Home Minister on 13 August, it was astonishing that the Commonwealth Secretary of the Foreign Office should reverse the policy of his own Prime Minister.

Thereafter we had to renew our attempts to seek a peaceful and proper solution of this very difficult problem. During the course of our negotiations on Kashmir, in Calcutta, I proposed to the Leader of the Indian delegation, Sardar Swaran Singh, that this very important and vital problem affecting relationship between our two countries should be tackled at a ministerial conference and that our proposal for a joint investigation to determine citizenship should be considered at that ministerial conference. I also pointed out that as we were engaged in the solution of the Kashmir dispute, two other Ministers from both the countries should simultaneously take up this problem. The Indian Minister said that he would convey the proposal to his Government and let us know the decision in due course. By way of abundant caution I informed him that if I were to get involved in this problem it would eclipse the Kashmir talks which were of most vital consideration to the two Governments; and as such it would be preferable for two other Ministers to meet. In spite of this qualification the Indian Government subsequently replied that they have nominated Sardar Swaran Singh, who was negotiating the Kashmir dispute, to partake in the negotia-

tion of this problem; their objective and the purpose was quite clear and it would have been quite naive on our part to have fallen into such a clean and neat trap.

So we again appealed to them that it would be much better if two other Ministers, especially the Home Ministers who were more concerned with this problem, take up this issue, but to that they made no reply. In the subsequent discussions we again took up this question with them. We said if it was not possible for another Minister to be appointed for this purpose then the officials who had accompanied their delegation and our officials of the Foreign Office could get together and evolve the procedural and other preliminary formalities which would have enabled us to proceed with this problem so that we could come to grips with it and find a solution, because a solution was possible. The citizenship of the evictees could be determined; it was determinable; it is not that it was not determinable. There again we met with a blank.

It has been suggested to us that we should take up this matter to the United Nations. We did take it up in the United Nations in the last session of the General Assembly; and Mr. Mohammad Ali in his intervention in the seventeenth session of the General Assembly took up this question very eloquently, and possibly drove home the point that these evictions were against the Charter of Fundamental Human Rights and were against all canons of established diplomacy and international intercourse. However, as has been pointed out by certain Members in the House there are certain limitations when a problem goes to the United Nations.

We have also been told that there is United Nations Refugee Commission for Congo and Palestine and that a similar relief Commission could be established for the people who have been evicted by the Indian Government. I regret to say that this is not according to the Charter of the United Nations or International Law. The Palestine refugees and the Congo refugees became refugees as a result of armed clash and armed conflict, as a result of war between the so-called state of Israel and the Arab states. Also, in the Congo there was a breach of peace and as a result of the breach of peace they became refugees. If these refugees were also in a similar situation then the question of our asking for international commission to take up this matter would arise, otherwise it would be *ultra vires* of the existing rules of International Law. We are examining the possibility of taking up this question in the eighteenth session of the General Assembly, but we have to proceed according to the recognized Law of United Nations. United Nations is not going to make an exception for the sake of Pakistan; it will have to go by the norms of international practice and law.

At the same time we feel that it would be preferable to evolve some solution by bilateral talks. For this we are making endeavours to get together

with the Government of India at a ministerial level or at the level of Provincial Ministers in order to tackle this problem. There are *bona fides* on our part; we do not want to create problems for anybody, we do not want to create problems for ourselves, we do not want to create problems for the Government of India. The Government of India should reciprocate this feeling and should not unnecessarily create problems for us. This is a difficult matter because from the practical point of view what are we to do. These poor, wretched, helpless people are pouring into Pakistan; how can we close our borders to them? It would be an inhuman and barbaric act to close our frontiers to our own brethren Muslims who are being driven out of their own homes and hearths. So we cannot close and seal our borders. This would be completely wrong. No Government in Pakistan should contemplate doing a thing like that. At the same time, I may point out that if we permanently rehabilitate them—this is exactly what the Government of India wants Pakistan to do in order to shatter its economy—the border will be open endlessly and the caravan of these poor and unfortunate people would proceed endlessly in spite of our limitations. When the problem exists, continues from day to day, from moment to moment, you cannot momentarily absorb people.

Only recently we have released 4,66,500 rupees to the Government of East Pakistan for spending over these unfortunate people. In addition we have given them earlier also a sum of Rs. 19,66,500 for this purpose. So money has been provided continuously to the Government of East Pakistan for giving every material assistance to these people. It is, therefore, wrong to say that the effort that is being made is the effort of only the Government of East Pakistan. The Government of East Pakistan are our Government; they are part and parcel of the same organization, of the same polity. We are doing everything within our resources to assist the Government of East Pakistan in tackling this gigantic problem which requires skill, patience and fortitude.

Now I would ask my friends to please appreciate our difficulties. We have been persistently seeking a solution of this problem with the Government of India, and a solution of this problem has to be found. It must be found. We are convinced that if the Government of India is interested, genuinely interested, in finding a solution to this problem, then they would respond to this move and act in the right direction in the name of reason, humanity and justice. But if they do not do so, and this problem is magnified and becomes more and more difficult, then we will have to go to the United Nations, we will have no alternative but to go to the United Nations. But before going the U.N. to we must exhaust all the other possible remedies at Governmental level.

Various other suggestions have been made such as taking repressive

measures against the Hindu minority in Pakistan. I would like to say that it is a deplorable suggestion for the Government of Pakistan and the people of Pakistan to discard all the principles of their religion and all the principles of humanitarian considerations. We should never take such a deplorable attitude and resort to the practice where eye for eye and teeth for teeth is the law. We should not contaminate ourselves; we should not lower ourselves to that level of degradation and indecency. To do that to our own citizens, for they are our citizens, whether Hindus, Parsis or Christians, is unthinkable. They have to be protected by the laws of the land irrespective of the provocation that is given by the so-called secular state of India.

I would like to repeat that this problem is a problem engaging our attention all the time. We are perplexed by it; we are actually concerned by it; we are making every attempt for direct Ministerial talks with the Indians for trying to find out a solution to it. It is wrong on the part of our friends to charge that we are callous, that we did nothing during the ministerial conference. We did make serious attempts there; we made attempts even before that conference; and we are continuing in our efforts. We do not want a vitiated atmosphere. We do not want to bring about a situation from which there is no point of return. I can assure the Honourable Members of the House that this is one of the most important problems that is facing the country today and everything possible will be done by us to resolve it. It is no use making eloquent speeches and asking for actions which will do an injury to this country. The responsibility is ours and we have to discharge it according to what is the recognized practice and what is the accepted practice. We have to be realistic. If we act in an irresponsible way, if we act foolishly, if we act in a manner in which larger interests of the country suffer and people of Pakistan suffer, then I am afraid the same people will blame us for irresponsibility and for having acted foolishly.

Now, Sir, finally I would like to say this much that this problem has been discussed before in the Dacca session, and technically we could have said that we do not want to discuss it. That would have been a wrong approach. Whenever possible we will try and take this House into confidence on all important and vital problems, because these problems are theirs as much as they are ours. Please do not think that we would not like to share the responsibilities and the interests of the country. This is a sovereign legislature and I must admit that today I speak in a melancholy mood because I am no longer a member of the brotherhood of this House. I consider it to be sad because I speak here in my individual capacity as a Minister and not as a representative of the people, because I consider it no greater honour than to represent my people. And I would like to say this that as long as I am in office even without a representative capacity, I shall strive in every way possible to serve the interests of my former constituency and the people of Pakistan.

Speech in the National Assembly on July 17, 1963

Reappraisal of Foreign Policy—Arms for India—Negotiations with India on Kashmir—Boundary Agreement with China

This nation, born in the midst of crisis has, during the last fifteen years of its existence, witnessed many emergencies. But I submit that the emergency through which it is now passing is, perhaps, the gravest it has had to face.

Our foreign policy is being subjected today to rethinking and reappraisal. This is because of certain internal developments in the political life of the country and certain external developments set in motion by some major decisions of the big powers in relation to the sub-continent.

During the past years, there have been occasions when there was a demand for the reformulation of our foreign policy. As is well known, some political parties and schools of political thought in Pakistan were not reconciled to the foreign policy that had been adopted for the country. However, on those occasions the compulsive force of the developments of which I have spoken was absent and consequently no change of policy took place. Today, we are confronted with not only the arguments of the dissenters for a revision of our foreign policy, reinforced by our experience of the past decade, but also the impact of the events of the last few months. We are thus compelled to reconsider Pakistan's basic position in international affairs.

The searching re-examination through which we are going might well lead to a metamorphosis in our national life. For that reason, I would urge the House to be good enough to concede the Government's request to limit the discussion to the fundamentals of our foreign policy and not to go into the details of its various problems. These problems are at present being identified and reappraised by the Government. Only last November, we

had in this House a long and exhaustive debate on external affairs, when every aspect of them was discussed. In the Dacca session, the House had yet another opportunity of debating our foreign relations. The present position is but a continuation of the emergency that arose last October. The events that have since taken place are a logical sequel of the crisis which was precipitated in the sub-continent by the Sino-Indian conflict and the decision of the Western Powers to extend massive military aid to India. Thus, the situation which we are facing today is basically the same as that which we faced in October and November, 1962. Moreover, all the events which have since taken place are known to the House. The emergency which existed at that time was debated in a secret session. The House had also the opportunity of hearing the President of Pakistan. In consequence, the members of the Assembly are sufficiently well informed on the thinking of the Government and the Government is similarly informed on the thinking of the country. Nor is there any need to repeat all the arguments that can be presented in favour of or against the foreign policy of Pakistan.

As I said in my opening remarks, the present threat to the national security and territorial integrity of Pakistan is by no means the first one in its experience. We have had to face crisis after crisis from the very day that our country came into existence, all because of India's unfortunate antagonism. The fact that India has been enabled by the Western Powers to augment its military strength to a most formidable extent has made the situation even more disturbing and dangerous. This augmentation is being brought about through the assistance principally of the United States of America and the United Kingdom, with both of whom we are associated in defence alliances. This is the new element which has been injected into the situation and which aggravates it.

During the last fifteen years, India has embarked on a course of aggression on no less than five occasions. This indeed is a record which any aggressor state, in the history of the world, might well envy. On a number of occasions, the Prime Minister of India, his cabinet colleagues, the Ministers of provincial governments in India and the leaders of political parties in that country have made statements naming Pakistan as India's Enemy Number One. This declaration of enmity was repeated even during the Sino-Indian fighting by officials and other responsible spokesmen of the Government of India. Such is the position which India has taken up in relation to Pakistan. However, notwithstanding the professions of peaceful intent and of pacific policies by India, in actual fact, India is an aggressor state. Therefore, when India is arming itself feverishly, as she is at present, we cannot look upon it with equanimity. The situation which has thus been created is a grave one. It poses for us a threat, to counter which we need all our resources and strength.

This situation is not of our making. On the contrary, we have been doing everything in our power to prevent the developments that have led to it. However, it was beyond our capacity to prevent them. In the Sino-Indian conflict are involved the two largest states of the East. We can do little to influence the course of the conflict between them, much less to bring about its termination.

We have told the Western Powers repeatedly that the augmentation of India's military strength is directed principally against Pakistan, to whose separate existence as a nation India has not really reconciled itself. We have adduced proof of this fact by inviting attention to India's past conduct as an aggressor state and to the utterances of responsible Indian leaders, betraying their aggressive intentions towards our country. We have reminded the Western Powers of the fact that the history of the sub-continent over a period of more than eight hundred years is the history of conflict between its two major communities. That conflict which at times took the form of war has continued after the partition. The Kashmir dispute has magnified and aggravated the mutual suspicions and fears which bedevil relations between Pakistan and India.

Unfortunately, we and the Western Powers proceed on different basic assumptions. Their assumption is that, in the twentieth century, a state like India cannot embark on aggression against Pakistan and that the United Nations is there to prevent aggression and to cope with warlike crises anywhere in the world. The Western Powers also claim that they themselves can control the use of the arms given by them to India, so that they are not used against Pakistan. Further they have given us an assurance to the effect that if India embarks on aggression against us, they will come to our assistance. They consider that the Government and the people of Pakistan should be satisfied with this assurance as a guarantee of this country's security and independence.

We think otherwise. In the first place, history gives abundant proof of the fact that in any given situation it is difficult to determine who the aggressor is. It will be even more difficult now if modern weapons are used. It will not be possible to prove which party committed the first act that is to be classed as aggression, which party was the first to fire the shot and whether the first shot was fired in aggression or in self-defence. The United Nations, and the International Law Commission and, before them, the League of Nations, were seized with the problem of defining aggression. But no definition of it has yet been found. There is nothing more important for a sovereign state than actually to prevent aggression against itself, for after one's homes and cities have been destroyed, there is not much that can be done about it. The augmentation of India's military strength through the United States and the United Kingdom aid has given rise to a situation in which

the threat to our security is being menacingly intensified and compounded.

Furthermore, India is in a position to sell its own products for money and with that money to purchase armaments from countries other than the United States and the United Kingdom. This in itself is a cause of alarm for Pakistan. And, of course, there are India's own resources of arms and the substantial military assistance it is receiving from the Soviet Union. It is poor consolation to be told that if aggression is committed against Pakistan by India, the United States will come to Pakistan's assistance. But after aggression has taken place, with its concomitant loss of life and destruction of property, that will be meaningless.

The same assurance was given to India when the United States embarked on an arms aid programme to Pakistan. It might be recalled that at that time, the boot was on India's leg, and India had put forward the same arguments to discount the assurance that the United States would come to its assistance if it were attacked by Pakistan. But the assurance given to Pakistan is different in one sense. This difference arises from the fact that Pakistan is in every respect a far smaller country than India. Even if we make every possible sacrifice, with our resources and with the aid that we might get, we would still not be able to match India's resources or India's intrinsic strength. The best we could do would be to try and maintain some sort of a precarious balance. The reason is that India has over four times of Pakistan's population, territory, economic wealth and technical skill. Therefore, while the assurance given to India by the United States was quite superfluous that given to Pakistan is of little or no value in a situation in which our security is in jeopardy.

This point of view, which represents our genuine apprehension, has been made fully known both to the United States and the United Kingdom. They, however, feel that their global interests and policies require the containment of international Communism. They argue that these same considerations formed the basis of Western economic and military assistance to Pakistan. In view of their global policy and their belief that there is a real threat to India, they regard it as necessary for them to give military assistance to India. They even claim that had it not been for Pakistan's objections and fears, their assistance to India would have been on a much larger scale. As it is, they say, the aid given to India is limited in quantity and defensive in character.

The agreement reached at Nassau was to the effect that the United States and the United Kingdom would offer military assistance to India of the value of 120 million dollars. A few months later, on 30th June, a joint communique was issued by President Kennedy and Prime Minister Macmillan announcing their further decision to give long term military assistance to India over and above that which had already been provided for under the

Nassau Agreement. We are not yet in a position to inform the House about the exact scope and nature of this latest agreement, for its terms have not been disclosed to us. When they are, we shall, should the need and the opportunity for it arise during the session, announce them in the House, or inform the nation of them through the Press.

I have stated that in spite of our best efforts, we have not been able to dissuade the United States and the United Kingdom from taking the decision to give long term military assistance to India. It may be that under that decision the aid will be limited in quantity or that it will be of a defensive character. However, let me say that we find no satisfaction in the assurance that the aid will be of a limited, controllable and defensive character, for we know that these are fatuous qualifications. In practical and pragmatic terms, they are meaningless.

This being the position, how then can Pakistan safeguard its independence and territorial integrity? We have been told that in the twentieth century it is not possible for a state to embark on naked aggression against another, such as ours, with its population of one hundred million. We have replied that this argument is not a tenable one. Even if it be assumed that India will not be in a position to embark on wholesale aggression against Pakistan, the situation between the two countries will still further deteriorate, for India will have been put in such a position as to be able to dictate to a neighbouring country from a position of strength.

India's bargaining position will thus be artificially increased to such an extent as will preclude, for all time, the possibility of its agreeing to a settlement on any except its own inequitable terms with a country which is militarily its inferior. The issue thus is not only that India is receiving military assistance, which may be used against Pakistan, but also that the augmentation of India's military strength invests it with a most dangerous power of dictating its own terms in its disputes with other states. That too is a matter which we have to consider very seriously. Time is running out. With the passage of time, as the military and economic strength of India increases, the possibilities of its agreeing to a peaceful and reasonable settlement of our outstanding diputes with it are correspondingly reduced.

I have mentioned the important development that followed the November crisis. When we agreed to negotiations with India over the Kashmir problem, we had said that it was necessary for the Western Powers ot link up military assistance to India with an honourable settlement on Kashmir. Now there should be no misunderstanding about it. It was not that we were trying to take advantage of the situation that had been created for India. In terms of political realism and morality our plea was justifiable and righteous. We were making a request which, if agreed to, would have yielded positive and substantial results. We were not linking our problems or disputes with the

problems or disputes of India with any other country. All that we were doing was to link, as history had already linked, the grave issue of happiness or misery for the Kashmiri people with that of peace or war in our area. If there had been a settlement of the Kashmir problem on an honourable and equitable basis, that would have provided a great opportunity for the pursuit of peaceful policies in the entire sub-continent. Such a settlement would have released new energies and opened up new paths of mutual co-operation between the peoples of Pakistan and India. But unfortunately, India was not serious about a Kashmir settlement.

India did not really fear Chinese aggression, for it knew, as did the rest of us, that the conflict with China was no more than a border clash, brought about by India's own impetuousity. That being the position, what India really wanted was to augment its military strength and potential to be directed, not so much against Communist China, as against the country which it had declared to be its Enemy Number One. Today we are faced with a delicate situation which might lead us to the threshold of a new phase of our national history. This situation is engaging the most serious attention of the Government. This much we know and can say that if, God forbid, we should be involved in a clash with India, that is if India were, in its frustration, to turn its guns against Pakistan, the international position being what it is, Pakistan would not be alone.

That conflict would not involve Pakistan only. An attack by India on Pakistan would no longer confine the stakes to the independence and territorial integrity of Pakistan. An attack by India on Pakistan would also involve the security and territorial integrity of the largest state in Asia. This new factor that has arisen is a very important one. I would not, at this stage, wish to elucidate it any further. It would suffice to say that the national interests of another state would be involved in an Indian attack on Pakistan because that state and other states know about India's aggressive intentions and know that India is capable of embarking on aggression against other countries. Therefore, a defeated Pakistan or a subjugated Pakistan would not only mean annihilation for us but also pose a serious threat to other countries of Asia and particularly to the largest state of Asia. From that point of view and as a result of the other international factors that have recently come into operation, I think I can confidently say that every thing is being done by the Government to see that our national interests and territorial integrity are safeguarded and protected.

At the same time, I would like to say that in spite of the grave crisis that we face, we should not feel alarmed to the point of permitting any sort of moral imbalance to develop in our national life. Our people will face the present crisis, as they have faced all crises in the past, with calmness and dignity.

The United States has declared that the military assistance which Pakistan has received from it is not to be used against India and that similarly the military assistance which India is receiving from it is not to be used against Pakistan. The United States maintains that just as the arms given by it to Pakistan are so controlled that they cannot be used by Pakistan against India, it will be ensured that the arms given by it to India will not be used against Pakistan. Even though I have expressed my doubts about its efficacy, this guarantee exists. This fact is not without importance in the context of the present situation.

The question now is that of maintaining a military balance between Pakistan and India in order to prevent a conflict in the sub-continent. In view of the arms build-up in India, it becomes incumbent upon Pakistan to increase its own military strength. The argument that the United States does not give military assistance to Pakistan to be used against India is no longer valid. If military assistance to India is controllable, so that it cannot be used against Pakistan, further augmentation of Pakistan's military strength, in order to assure a balance, need not be regarded as directed against India, for additional military assistance to Pakistan should also be capable of being controlled. It is imperative that in the interest of peace there should be a military balance between India and Pakistan and an assurance that this balance will not be upset so that neither state becomes capable of embarking on aggression against the other.

We have in the past experienced many vicissitudes in our relations with the Western Powers. For the present deterioration in our relations with them, we are not responsible, any more than we are responsible for the developments which have led to it. It is for the Western Powers to arrest this deterioration. It is for them to act in such a manner as to assure the security of Pakistan and the inviolability of its political, economic and social systems.

The House particularly wishes to be informed on the question of our negotiations with India over Kashmir. I should like to take this opportunity to make a brief statement about them. The discussion at our first meeting at Rawalpindi was confined to a preliminary examination of the points of view of India and Pakistan, in particular of the issues involved in the dispute as India saw them. At Delhi, where we had the second round of talks, we pressed further our contention that the only honourable method of solving the Kashmir problem was that the people of Kashmir should decide their own future. In the third round of talks we continued to press for a plebiscite under the aegis of the United Nations. India raised various objections to the procedure of a plebiscite, whether an overall one or a limited one. It was in the course of this round that the Indians gave us their proposal, which was none other than that which they had suggested

in the past. It amounted to nothing more than a readjustment of the existing cease-fire line. They were reminded that, at the very outset, in the first round of talks in Rawalpindi, we had told them that if they were to put forward a proposal for a settlement on the basis of the cease-fire line, it would be wholly unacceptable to us, and that, therefore, any such proposal would not provide even a starting point for the discussions. Nonetheless, that was what the Indians put forward. Pakistan naturally rejected it. True, we were advised that this proposal should be regarded only as the beginning, that it should not be considered to represent India's final position and that, therefore, we should persist in the negotiations.

In the fourth round, the issues were related not to Kashmir, but to the question of our boundary agreement with China. In the fifth round at Karachi, we reached a stalemate. It was apparent that India would not move forward at all. Thereafter, in the sixth and final round, we informed the Indian delegation that in our view a plebisicte was the only honourable, practical and proper basis for a settlement of the Kashmir problem. We were quite willing that, for about one year, the Valley of Kashmir be put under international control, with the provision that, at the end of that period, to ascertain the wishes of its people, a plebiscite shall be held or their wishes ascertained through some other method and their future decided accordingly. This proposal, which we considered to be a fair one for an honourable and equitable settlement of the Kashmir dispute, was also rejected by India.

I might here mention that the proposal for a partial plebiscite which was first made by General McNaughton and then by Sir Owen Dixon had been favourably considered by past Governments of Pakistan. The only variation which we made in it was to limit the plebiscite to the Valley, whose future constitutes the crux of the problem. It is in the Valley that the majority of the people of the state live. We proposed that for a period of a year or so, I would say at the most a year or fifteen months, there should be some agency—an impartial international agency—to supervise and control the administration of the Valley and that this agency should be empowered to hold a plebiscite at the end of that period. This proposal was rejected by India as being in essence the same as the one which had been advocated by Pakistan in the past.

It has often been asked whether there has been any advantage in having had these negotiations with India. I think history alone can be the judge of that question. But it is our view that Pakistan has definitely gained by entering into them. I shall briefly state the reasons for this view. First, as far as the United Nations was concerned, the problem of Kashmir had lost its urgency and importance. Moreover, the Soviet Union always exercised its veto whenever an attempt was made to get the Security Council to adopt

an effective resolution on Kashmir. In the meantime, India had consolidated its position in Kashmir.

Furthermore, in the last ten years, India had built the fortress of its case on the assumption that there was no Kashmir problem, that Kashmir was an integral and inseparable part of India, that constitutionally, politically and economically, it was as much a part of India as any other of its provinces, that the Constituent Assembly of Kashmir had taken certain fundamental decisions as to the future of the state, that they had had three elections in Kashmir and that as far as the reality of international politics was concerned there was no such thing as a Kashmir dispute or a Kashmir problem. This view was put forward not only by India but was also advocated by certain important and powerful states, whose names are known to the members of this House. One of these states is so important as to have the right of veto in the Security Council. The recent negotiations are overwhelming evidence of the fact that the Kashmir problem continues to exist and that it is a major problem affecting international peace and security.

At the end of the negotiations in May, a communique was issued in which it was admitted by India that the negotiations did not result in the settlement of the Kashmir dispute. Thus the contention which had in the past been advanced by India and propagated throughout the world that there was no such thing as the problem of Kashmir has been debunked. That incidentally has caused some embarrassment to the great power which had supported the Indian stand. Moreover, there is evidence that in the view of the Indian Press and the Indian public opinion, if from these negotiations any benefit has accrued to any party, it has not accrued to India. We have lost nothing through them. On the contrary, I submit that we have gained. World attention has again been focussed on the Kashmir dispute and its importance as an international issue has been highlighted. That importance will continue to be recognized until an honourable and equitable solution is found for it.

The members of the House also wish to be informed about the boundary agreement with China. On that matter, I beg to submit that in December 1960 we had decided to make a proposal to China for the demarcation of our undefined boundary with it. In February 1961, we entered into negotiations with that country. In March 1961 we made to it a formal request for a boundary agreement.

As a result, some preliminary exchanges of views on the subject took place, but no substantial progress was made. At that time India contended with the People's Republic of China that Pakistan had no right to negotiate for that part of Kashmir, which, though under Pakistan's physical control, was a part of the territory of the State of Jammu and Kashmir and legally a part of India, and that India was the only sovereign authority to negotiate

a settlement of the boundary in question.

In support of this contention, India tried to muster the assistance of the Soviet Union and some other powers. However, in spite of Indian demarches, our negotiations with China made satisfactory progress. The Sino-Indian conflict gave a fresh impetus to these negotiations. You can well understand the reason for it. No state would care to be confronted at the same time with problems or unresolved situations on two fronts. Be that as it may, we were the gainers by entering into negotiations to delimit our boundary with China. We saw no reason to delay the conclusion of an agreement about it, for we ourselves had initiated the negotiations. The late Mr. Mohammed Ali of Bogra was to go to the People's Republic of China to conclude the agreement. Most unfortunately, he did not live to do so, and I had to go in his place. We came to a speedy and satisfactory settlement of the boundary. Under this settlement, Pakistan gained about 750 square miles of territory, some of it rich in natural resources, particularly the salt mines of Oprang, which the people of Hunza and the surrounding territory consider necessary for their needs and for their economic well being. It is a matter of the greatest importance that through this agreement we have removed any possibility of friction on our only common border with the People's Republic of China. We have eliminated what might well have become a source of misunderstanding and of future troubles.

As far as Afghanistan is concerned, you know that for a number of years our relations with that country had been going from bad to worse. I should not like now to go into the question why those relations detriorated. I would only submit that it was not at our initiative that there was a break in them. It was Afghanistan which about two years ago severed diplomatic relations with Pakistan.

This was sad and painful for us, for Afghanistan is a neighbour of ours and a Muslim country. Because of these facts, we have always desired to have with it the best of relations. This year, due to the initiative of the Shahinshah of Iran, who made strenuous efforts in this respect, we entered into negotiations for the resumption of diplomatic and trade relations with Afghanistan. These negotiations which took place in Tehran were most fruitful. As a consequence, I am happy to inform the House that we shall in the near future be sending an Ambassador to Kabul. The person we have chosen for this post is an outstanding man, possessed of military and diplomatic experience. He has been a General in our army and has held important ambassadorial assignments. This person is General Yusuf, who at present is our High Commissioner in the United Kingdom. He will go to Kabul as soon as possible.

As I have said, it is our cherished desire to have normal, indeed friendly,

relations with all countries, particularly with such of them as are our neighbours. We have no ill-will or animosity towards any of them. We wish to live in peace, in mutual understanding and friendship with all countries. In the achievement of this objective we have fully succeeded, except in so far as only one state is concerned. That state is India.

We have always advocated the method of negotiation for settling disputes and resolving problems, as we did with China. If you agree to peaceful methods of settlement of disputes, you must also agree to the principle of give and take. That being so, especially when the two negotiating states are neighbours and on friendly terms, what is important is not any one part or aspect of the negotiations between them but their cumulative outcome, their total effect on the entirety of a situation. When in order to resolve a dispute, you enter into meaningful negotiations, you cannot proceed on the basis of take it or leave it, for that can only result in a breakdown of the talks. If this proposition is not accepted by my friends of the Opposition, then there is no purpose and no point in the Government entering into any negotiations to resolve any dispute.

I said that we had gained 750 square miles of territory from the People's Republic of China. Has that not been a real gain for us? And China, too, did not lose on the whole. In fact, it gained in the sense that it came to a settlement over the question of the boundary with Pakistan, hitherto an undefined boundary. The settlement laid the foundation for normal and good neighbourly relations. After all what is our objective? If the objective is to seek the good of our own country and also to seek the good of the world at large, then it can be achieved only through such settlements as the one we have arrived at with China. Our aim is to have the most friendly and peaceful relations with as many countries as possible. I am happy to be able to say that our endeavours in pursuit of that aim have yielded good results. We have arrived at the boundary settlement with the People's Republic of China, so that we should have a peaceful and harmonious relationship with that great country and that there should be no cause for misunderstanding or friction over our common boundary. We have resumed diplomatic relations with Afghanistan, a Muslim country, so that we should be able to live with it in peace, amity and good neighbourliness. We have settled outstanding issues with Iran, the country with whom we have always had the friendliest of relations. We have sorted out our differences with Burma and it is hoped that, before the end of the year, the President of the Revolutionary Council of Burma will visit Pakistan. We have greatly improved our relations with Nepal, a fact highlighted by the visit of our President to that country. We recently had the honour of having the President of Indonesia in our midst. This has been most satisfactory in that it has led to the consolidation of our relations with Indonesia, a Muslim

country of a hundred million people. With Ceylon, too, we have good friendly relations. On the invitation of its Government, our President will pay a visit to Ceylon this year. With the Philippines and Thailand, which are our allies, we have the most amicable and cordial relations.

Thus, we are on good terms with all our neighbours, near or distant, except India. India is on bad terms not only with us but also with almost all its other neighbours. The arrogant attitude of the Government of India and its refusal to adopt a spirit of conciliation in its dealings with neighbouring countries has brought about a situation which is most unfortunate and undesirable for Pakistan as well as for other countries. I would not like to name those countries. They are known to the members of the House. We know what kind of relations India has with its neighbour Pakistan, its neighbour the People's Republic of China and its other neighbours. The whole world knows it. How is it that all countries, except India, can, on a basis of mutual understanding, achieve a settlement of their differences with others? Why cannot India? That country stands out as the great exception amongst those that are seeking to bring about understanding, tranquillity and peace in this region and in the world.

Recently there have been negotiations for an Air Service Agreement between Pakistan and China. There have been references to this matter in the press. This Agreement is likely to be of great commercial importance for us. It will reduce the air distance between Pakistan and Japan by three to four hours. Correspondingly it will also reduce the distance of flights from other parts of the world passing through Pakistan to Tokyo.

In order to be able to extend PIA services to Tokyo, we had asked for landing rights in Hong Kong. Unfortunately these rights were not granted to us. We had, therefore, to ask for landing rights in the territory of the People's Republic of China. Those rights having been granted, we should now be able to take our air net-work around the world. I should mention for the information of the House that other countries have also asked for transit rights through the People's Republic of China for their airlines and are ready to negotiate with it for them.

Before I resume my seat, I should like to say that we realize that the situation with which we are faced is a grave one. We know that the days ahead are going to be difficult. I wish to assure the House that we are making every effort to resolve the situation and to ward off danger to our national security. In this endeavour, we need the co-operation of the representatives of the nation here in this Assembly and in the Provincial Assemblies. At this juncture, nothing can be a greater source of strength to the Government than the support of the people. We know that they appreciate the magnitude of the crisis confronting the country. We believe that they can and will help their Government to surmount it. We should

not like to see a deterioration of our relations with the Western Powers. However, it is not for us to take the initiative in this matter, because we are the injured party; we are the ones who have cause to feel concerned. It is for them to take the necessary measures—and these measures can be taken—to bring about a change in the situation which would be in the interest of our mutual relations.

As far as the question of Kashmir is concerned, it remains the most important, indeed, the basic issue in Pakistan's foreign policy. This issue is responsible for the great gulf that divides us and India. It constitutes a grave problem for the world. Although we have a great stake in it, the stake of the Kashmiris is the greatest of all. It is nothing short of a tragedy that they are being denied their right of self-determination. In fact they are the only people in this region who still suffer under a colonial regime and an oppressive regime at that. Today, the people of Kashmir are being called up to contribute to the war effort of India. They have no concern at all with the so-called threat to India or with the armed conflict in which India is involved, Kashmir is not a part of India.

Finally, I should like to say on behalf of the Government that we are looking forward to this debate on foreign policy. I wish to express the hope that after the members have spoken, I shall be afforded an opportunity to elucidate the position of the Government on the points raised by them.

Speech in the National Assembly on July 24, 1963

Boundary Agreement with Iran—Relations with Afghanistan and Other Asian Countries—Kashmir Not a Settled Question—Relations With the West.

I am thankful to the Chair for the indulgence that has been shown to me in permitting me to address the House while sitting in my seat. I also wish to apologise to those members of the House whose speeches I was not able to hear. This was because I could not be present in the House on account of my illness to which you, Sir, have alluded in such sympathetic terms. There was, of course, no question of discourtesy on my part to the members. However, I have asked to be furnished with a full record of the proceedings of the House, so that I should be fully informed of all that was said in my absence.

I do not know whether it would be appropriate for me to refer to the recriminations that some members have indulged in during last forty-eight hours. However, I am a human being, with all the failings of a human being. As such, it should surprise no one if I were tempted to reply to the wholly incorrect and unfounded personal allegations that have been made against me by certain members of the House. But, on further consideration, I have decided to refrain from doing so, for the very good reason that the allegations are so obviously false, and known to be such to every one, that it would be a waste of the time of the House to attempt to answer them.

Some of the points made by the members of the Opposition about foreign policy in the course of this debate were mutually contradictory. On the one hand, we were told that the Government had not come forward with a forthright and positive foreign policy and that it had taken shelter behind time-worn phrases and apologies which have been repeated with monotonous regularity for the past fifteen years. For their part, the members of the Opposition have not made any concrete suggestions as to

policy. After all, they are representatives of the people and in this House collectively represent one hundred million people. If, according to the Opposition, we, in the Government, have not been able to enunciate a bold and clear foreign policy, such as is required by our present circumstances and the prevailing conditions, the eminent members of the Opposition ought to come forward with ideas about such a policy. However, they have not made any constructive suggestions.

We have been told that by the manner in which we go about begging for arms we have made an international nuisance of ourselves. I admit that one should be ashamed to beg. However, if the interests of the country demand that we should beg, then I suggest that begging becomes an act of patriotism and as such deserves commendation rather than condemnation.

Actually the question of begging does not arise. The fact is that the geo-political position of Pakistan is important to the world and to the global strategy of the great powers. We do not get aid and assistance because we beg for it. We get aid and assistance because Pakistan is a nation of a hundred million people with a geopolitical position of great importance. West Pakistan adjoins the Middle East, a region of vital concern to the world. The other half of the country *i.e.*, East Pakistan, is on the periphery of the sensitive areas of South East Asia. That being so it is in the interest of certain powers to give aid to Pakistan. Pakistan having committed itself to defence alliances with those powers, they are giving it aid. Thus there is mutuality of interests and reciprocity between Pakistan and those who give it assistance.

We were told that India is being armed menacingly by the same powers and that the arms which are being given to it will be used against no other country than Pakistan. On the other hand, some members said that under no circumstances could India be a threat to Pakistan, for India was in a state of decomposition. As a matter of fact, one member said not that the process of disintegration was about to begin in India but that it had already started. He argued that therefore all the aid and assistance that India was receiving or might receive in the future would not really pose a threat to Pakistan.

Such statements are mutually contradictory. We have been advised by some members that Pakistan should not grudge massive military assistance to India because it was in the interest of the global strategy of the Western Powers to give such assistance to India. If it is claimed that this statement reflects the true state of public opinion in Pakistan then we should like the members who have made or support it to prove it. If the people of Pakistan are reconciled to this new development, then we should have no grievance against any one and indeed accept the contention that it is in the

global interest of the Western Powers to give military assistance to India.

However, this is not the correct position. I submit that the people of Pakistan are deeply concerned about the military assistance which is being given to India. Their concern is based on the fact that India has committed aggression on no less than five occasions during the last fifteen years and principally against Pakistan. We have, therefore, every cause to feel concerned. Really and fundamentally, it is not because of their global interests that the great powers are giving this massive assistance to India. They are giving it in order to make another Chungking out of New Delhi, to make another Kuomintang out of the present Indian regime. We know the fate of the assistance which was given to Chiang Kai-Shek. Chiang's China was in a state of decay and decomposition and consequently the assistance given to it could not be effectively utilised. India, too, is in a state of decay and degeneration. The result of giving it aid will be the same as it was in the case of China.

Some members of the House have charged the Government with having given away 3,000 square miles of our national territory to Iran without giving any information about it to this House. The Iran-Pakistan boundary agreement was concluded as far back as 6th February 1958. What took place on 16th July 1963 was purely the ceremonial act of the transfer of the areas concerned. This arose out of the obligation incurred by both the countries under the boundary agreement of 6th February 1958. It is not a fact that Pakistan has given away 3,000 square miles to Iran. We agreed to give to Iran 310 square miles of its territory, which had been forcibly occupied by the British, when they were rulers of the sub-continent and against which occupation the Government of Iran had always protested. In 1871, 1896 and 1905 Britain had forced Iran to conclude boundary agreements with it. But the Iranian Government had consistently refused to demarcate the boundary on the basis of those agreements. With the advent of Pakistan, and in view of its friendly and fraternal relations with Iran, a solution of this problem, which had been left over by history, became possible.

While the Government of Pakistan will transfer some 310 and not 3,000 square miles of territory to Iran, territory which had been in *de facto* occupation of the British Government of India, the Government of Iran has ceded 95 square miles of territory, hitherto under its occupation, to the Government of Pakistan. If the demarcation of the border had taken place in accordance with the 1905 agreement, concluded between the British and the Iranians, 300 square miles of territory would have had to be relinquished to Iran, but there would have been no cession by Iran of the 95 square miles of the territory which we are now acquiring under the agreement of 1958. I should, therefore, say that Pakistan has actually gained

95 square miles of territory under the border agreement with Iran. The ceremony about it which took place in Quetta on 15th July 1963 finally seals the friendship which has so long existed between Iran and Pakistan. As the members of the House are aware, Iran supports the right of self-determination of the people of Kashmir in accordance with the resolutions of the United Nations. I hope I have said enough about our relations with Iran and the actual position in respect of the boundary agreement that has recently been concluded between that country and Pakistan.

Reference has also been made to our relations with Afghanistan, a Muslim country and a neighbour of ours. We have the greatest respect for the people of Afghanistan. It was not of our choosing that diplomatic relations between Pakistan and Afghanistan were severed. We are aware of the fantastic territorial claim that has been made in Afghanistan against our country. I would not wish to mention this aspect of our problem, for, with the restoration of diplomatic relations between our two countries, we should all like to see the beginning of a new chapter of understanding between the peoples of Pakistan and Afghanistan.

As I have said, all that we have done is to restore diplomatic relations with Afghanistan. That answers the question of my friend, the leader of the Opposition. However, through the re-establishment of diplomatic relations and through contacts at various other levels, we hope we shall be able to settle also other problems which exist between Afghanistan and ourselves. In the same spirit, we are anxious to settle any problems that there might be between us and any other country. It was in this spirit that we asked the Government of India that it should co-operate with us in solving the Kashmir question, which has been a bar to goodwill between the people of India and the people of Pakistan.

We have settled our differences with other countries through the process of negotiation. Nor is this surprising, for as a member of the United Nations, we are committed to the peaceful settlement of disputes. My friends opposite have said that Pakistan should not claim credit for the good relations it has with its neighbours, Nepal, Ceylon, Indonesia, Burma and Afghanistan. I did not refer to our good relations with these countries with the object of claiming any credit for them, but only to show the contrast which exists between their attitude and India's. India's attitude is one of arrogance and intransigence in approaching problems which adversely affect its relations with its neighbours. What I said was meant to be more of an observation on India's attitude, intolerant and unaccommodating, towards its neighbours, Pakistan, Ceylon and China. Yet India claims to be a peace-loving state. The best way for it to demonstrate its peaceful intention and professions is to settle its disputes, not only with us, but with all its other neighbours, for we earnestly desire that all countries in the re-

gion should live in peace and concord with each other.

Unfortunately, India is the spoilt child of the world. India gets away with all its machinations by irrational explanations which the world only too readily swallows. The misfortune of this region is that the powers which are not familiar with India's mentality and do not understand India's approach to international problems are only too eager to accept India's policies on their face value. That makes it possible for India to continue to menace the peace of the region and the world.

Now, it has been said that we made a mistake in entering into negotiations with India on Kashmir. Our friends opposite have criticised us for having had these talks, but they have not given any good reasons for this criticism. The assumptions on which they proceed are not correct. They have said that by entering into the talks we compromise the Kashmiris' right to self-determination. I categorically declare that under no circumstances could that right have been compromised because of our negotiations with India. In round after round, in the first round, the second round, the third round, the fourth round, the fifth round and the sixth round, the right to self-determination of the people of Kashmir constituted our basic stand for a settlement. As stated earlier, in the ultimate analysis, it would be found that by entering into these negotiations we were the gainers.

I shall now show how, on the other hand, India was the loser through these negotiations. You will recall that during the past fifteen years, India always took the position that the problem of Kashmir had been settled and finished with. India maintained that Kashmir was an integral part of the Indian Union as much as Maharashtra or Orissa or Madras ; that constitutionally, politically, economically, socially and in every other way, the people of Kashmir were a part and parcel, and an inextricable one, of the Indian nation; and that consequently there was no such thing as a Kashmir dispute. In this respect, I should like to quote from some important statements made on behalf of India:

> "... Kashmir is the northern extremity of India ... the idea that this is in occupation, which is what has been represented to the Security Council, is a total misnomer ... The right of secession then, does not exist in our federation .. the Government of India .. cannot ever accept the idea that accession is anything but an indissoluble bond. When Kashmir acceded that matter was finished."
>
> —Mr. Krishna Menon in the Security Council on 23rd January, 1957.

"Therefore the accession of the State of Jammu and Kashmir on the 27th October was full and final accession .. So far as the sovereignty of Jammu and Kashmir is concerned, it has become the sovereignty of the Indian Union by the act of accession, by the treaty of the Maharaja

with the British Crown . . . There is no such thing in our Constitution as provisional accession . . ."

—Mr. Krishna Menon in the Security Council on 3rd May, 1962.

". . we regard the accession of the State of Jammu and Kashmir to the Union of India as full, complete and final, irrevocable and what is more, perpetual . . we shall not at any time submit this matter to what is called mediation or arbitration . . ."

—Mr. Krishna Menon in the Security Council on 4th May, 1962.

That was the position of the Government of India. It was on the basis of that position that India refused to reopen discussions on the Kashmir problem or to recognize it as a dispute and sought and received the support of the Soviet Union when Mr. Khrushchev visited India in 1955. At that time the Soviet leaders were told that this was India's final position; that India would never agree to negotiate on Kashmir, either directly with Pakistan or through the United Nations. It was on this basis that the Soviet Union lent its powerful support to India on the Kashmir question. But when negotiations were now reopened, it meant that India admitted the existence of the Kashmir dispute, for India came to the negotiating table to settle "the Kashmir dispute on an equitable and honourable basis." These are the words of the Joint Communique of 29th November 1962. This remained the position even after the conclusion of the talks when it was jointly stated that India and Pakistan had sought to arrive at an honourable and equitable solution of the Kashmir dispute but had been unable to do so. India has thus been led to abandon the premise of the finality of accession on the basis of which it had obtained the consistent support of the Soviet Union in the Security Council debates on Kashmir. This Government can take real and purposeful pride in having restored to the Kashmir question its status as one of the most important disputes facing the world.

Let me say, however, that the Kashmir problem is not one of our creation. We inherited it from the previous Governments of Pakistan. Who was responsible for stopping the fighting in Kashmir? Who was responsible for entering into the cease-fire agreement with India? Surely not this Government. The truth is that the previous Governments were responsible for mishandling the Kashmir problem. Weakness and vacillation characterised their policies. Their political instability had sapped the vitality of the country. If we are responsible for anything it is for having restored internal stability and resuscitated the Kashmir question.

We have made at least some progress in respect of Kashmir. We have through our exertions brought the problem back before the eyes of the

world. It is once again recognized as one of the most urgent problems facing the international community.

It has been stated what we missed a golden opportunity to settle the Kashmir question when there was fighting between China and India. I think that is a very irresponsible and short-sighted view. As I have said, by our tireless efforts and by our constant endeavours, we have made the Kashmir problem a live problem again. We have brought it down from the shelf to which it had been relegated.

To take advantage of the Sino-Indian conflict, India is determined to exaggerate its nature and extent. India's main aim of course is to acquire arms for purposes other than a war with China. In pursuit of that aim a war hysteria has been created in India. Economic policies have been adopted which bear heavily upon the common man. India has adopted a course of action which is impracticable and utterly futile. It has already caused a sense of demoralization amongst the people of that country and has increased the corruption and nepotism rampant in it. Nevertheless, in pursuit of its policies, the Government of India continues to enforce stringent measures. As a result of these measures, the people of that country are living in circumstances, of which economic distress is the normal characteristic and in which they have to suffer hardships and make sacrifices for a cause that they do not understand. How long can the Government of India sustain such policies against the will of its people? After all, the people of India are human beings; they need food, shelter and clothing like any other people. Denied most of these basic needs, they live in poverty, squalor and misery. The result is utter despondency.

Now, if that is the state of the feeling of the people of India, I ask you, what is the state of the feeling of the people of Kashmir who are not a part of the Indian nation and who have never regarded Kashmir as a part of India? Why should they be made to suffer privations and make sacrifices for a cause which is not their's, for a conflict in which they are not involved and in which they have no stake? Kashmir is a disputed territory. This fact India has acknowledged in the past and acknowledges it even today. Why should the people of Kashmir be called upon to suffer for the sake of India, in whose colonial bondage they are? India has no right to ask them to make sacrifices for a cause which is not their's. This is an important issue. In the past, India used to tell the world that Pakistan was a mediaeval theocratic state in which democracy did not exist. On the contrary, it was claimed that India had democratic institutions and had had three elections, and that it had steel mills, had otherwise made considerable economic progress and that the Indian people were leading a better life. And they argued that the people of Kashmir wished to be a part of the Indian nation, which had attained such prosperity. But can India even now

maintain that the people of Kashmir want to be a part of India? Indeed not and yet they are called upon to make the most painful sacrifices for the sake of India and to fight a war which they do not want.

If the people of Kashmir were today in Pakistan, they would, like the people of Azad Kashmir, Gilgit or Hunza, have been living in peace and security, with no conflict with their northern neighbour. But they are in Indian bondage and their land has been converted into a battle-ground. India has deprived Kashmir of its peace, tranquillity and security and turned it into a theatre of war against the People's Republic of China. These are important considerations which should be taken account of in the settlement of the Kashmir dispute.

First, the people of Kashmir have been called upon to bear privations and make sacrifices for the sake of India in a conflict to which they are not a party. Secondly, they have to contend with the way that armaments and implements of war have been thrown into their land. Because India cannot keep Kashmir under subjugation much longer, this state of affairs is bound to result in an explosion. To avoid that explosion India should agree to settle the problem of its future on equitable and honourable terms. If that were done, Pakistan would be willing to live in peace and friendship with India, as Pakistan has been living with all its other neighbours such as Ceylon, Afghanistan, Iran, Burma, and China. We would welcome such a development.

We are a nation that does not believe in conflict or war. Our history shows that we have never resorted to force. On the contrary, we have always exercised restraint in the face of provocation. It is India that has resorted to war and threats of war. But time is running out for India. It is now being exposed and, in the process, is being isolated.

First things must come first. India must realize what its real position is. In Asia today, India is a suspect nation. It is a nation which is not trusted by its neighbours. It is not trusted by the People's Republic of China. There is tension between India and Indonesia. There is deep suspicion about India's motives and conduct in Asian-African countries generally. How long can India persist in its follies and play the role of an arrogant isolated nation? India is not great enough nor big enough to play that role. Let India forsake its high and mightly posture. Let India settle on honourable terms its disputes with Pakistan. If India would only do that, a great and glorious era for the peoples of the sub-continent would be ushered in.

India has offered Pakistan a No War Pact. We do not see the hand of friendship in this offer. It is in fact a sinister offer. While the Kashmir dispute exists, it is inconceivable that we should accept India's offer of a No War Pact. If we accept it, we shall in effect accept the cease-fire line as the

final boundary between India and Pakistan in Kashmir. In other words, we shall be agreeing to the settlement of the Kashmir question through partition on the basis of the *status quo* as India desires. Thus a No War Pact, under the present circumstances, would mean the settlement of the problem of Kashmir on the basis of the *status quo*, without reference to its people, to which Pakistan will never agree—today, tomorrow, or a hundred years hence.

Furthermore, what does history teach us about No War Pacts? The fate of the Kellog Pact is well known. Nazi Germany concluded a No War Pact with the Soviet Union, the Ribbentrop-Molotov Pact. Yet Germany invaded the Soviet Union. A No War Pact with India can have the effect only of lulling us into a false sense of security and making us feel that India would not resort to force against us. Then, we could become easy victims of Indian aggression. In the last fifteen years, India has committed aggression as many as five times.

A No War Pact would be pressed into service by India as an estoppel on the Kashmir problem. Just as India has claimed that Pakistan is estopped by the Indus Basin Treaty from asserting its rights in respect of the Chenab river, India will, if Pakistan agrees to a No War Pact, claim in the same unscrupulous manner that Pakistan has accepted the present cease-fire line as a final settlement of the Kashmir question. The *status quo* would thus be perpetuated.

Both India and Pakistan are members of the United Nations and share, with all its member states, the obligation to settle their problems by peaceful procedures such as negotiation, conciliation, mediation and arbitration, as provided by Article 33 of the Charter. We on our part have peaceful intentions. This is evident from our conduct in international affairs during the past fifteen years, which is an enviable record for any peace-loving state. Unlike India, we attach very great importance to our reputation as a peace-loving state and to faithfully carrying out our international obligations. India merely wants to throw dust into the eyes of the world by saying that it offered Pakistan a No War Pact, which Pakistan refused. We are willing to have a No War Pact with India the moment it settles the Kashmir dispute. We are willing to enter into economic collaboration with India, the moment it puts an end to this problem. This problem, I declare, must be settled, and it will be settled, because no one can deny justice for all time to the people of Kashmir. Future history will show that the people of Kashmir will not for ever be denied their inalienable right of self-determination, the right which we have emphasized in all our negotiations with India.

Coming to our relations with the Western Powers, I am compelled to say that there has been a distorted presentation of facts by the members of the Opposition. It is not correct that we are putting forward a new plea for

charity, on the score that since India is now receiving so much more, Pakistan, too, should receive more. That is a gross and unfortunate misrepresentation of our position. What I stated was that tension existed in the sub-continent because there was in it a military imbalance. During the past fifteen years, we made sacrifices to maintain a military balance. We did so because history shows that in any given area the temptation of some states to resort to arms can be checked only through maintaining in it a balance of power. It has been in the interest of peace and security that we maintained some sort of military balance with India. Today, that balance is being upset. What we said was that the West should realise that this spelt danger and, if it wished to see peace and security in the sub-continent, it should do something to restore the balance. That is all that we said. We did not say that we were pleading for additional arms aid.

We have been associates of the West in defence alliances. We have been its comrades all these years. We have been with it through a series of crises. We have made sacrifices for the West. When the U-2 plane, supposed to have taken off from Peshawar, was shot down over Russia, Mr. Khrushchev did not say that India would be annihilated. He said that Pakistan would be annihilated. We have staked our whole future in the alliances with the West. We have staked involvement in a nuclear war in the event of a clash between the two *blocs*. And, yet what is happening today? We are, in the words of the unsophisticated, "being detached".

We wish to rehabilitate our relationship with the Western Powers, to revive our happier past association with them. It is for them to realize that Pakistan is the injured party. It is for them to understand the difficulties and dangers that Pakistan is facing. The point of *nemesis* has been reached. We ask the Western Powers to appreciate the issues involved, to hold the line and to bring about a new era of goodwill and co-operation, such as formerly existed between them and us. We value their friendship. They have assisted us in many ways. They have made a valuable contribution to our economic growth and to our military security. We are not unmindful of these facts. We are not ungrateful. Whatever may be the faults and follies of the people of Pakistan, one thing cannot be said of them, namely that they are an ungrateful people.

All that we are doing is to ask the West to appreciate the fact that India's increased military strength can only be directed against Pakistan. India has repeatedly said that Pakistan is India's Enemy Number One. It is India that has committed aggression. India committed aggression in Kashmir, in Junagadh and in Hyderabad. It has also committed aggression against Goa and in the boundary conflict with China. Thus India has committed aggression five times. Having ourselves experienced Indian aggression, it is but natural that we should expect the West to help maintain the present

precarious balance of power in the sub-continent.

We, on our part, shall maintain our traditional friendship with the Western Powers. We desire friendship not only with them, but also with and between all the countries of the world. We do not want to see conflict anywhere. The peoples of the world can have the opportunity of progressing socially, culturally and economically, only in conditions of undisturbed peace and security. We should like to have that opprtunity for our people in order to provide them with better life, to give them more and better homes, schools and hospitals. We want our people to feel that although they were born in poverty, they do not have to live for ever in poverty. We must meet the challenge of poverty and break through the barrier of want. We can succeed in our attempt to do so only if there is peace in our region, in Asia and in the world. For that reason, we are anxious to have good, cordial and friendly relations with all countries.

So far as we are concerned, we have always done our best to help in the promotion of measures conducive to peace. We have entered into a boundary agreement with the People's Republic of China, our great neighbour with a population of 650 million. In the same spirit, we are anxious to reach an understanding with India in regard to the problems that divide our two countries. But Pakistan by itself can do little about it. A heavy responsibility in this respect rests on India and on those nations that have now come to feel that they have a stake in India. The sooner they realize that responsibility the better will it be for all concerned.

When I speak today, I do not speak only for myself. Likewise when President Ayub speaks, he does not do so as an individual. Whenever any spokesman of the Government of Pakistan seeks to voice our deep concern over the threat to our security, he speaks for the hundred million people of this country. But, as I have said, we shall be able to meet this danger. Then there is the assurance we have from our friends, which we value, namely, that in the event of any aggression they will come to our assistance. We have assurances also from other countries that if India commits aggression against us, they will regard it as aggression against them. Thus we shall never be alone in facing aggression. We are also confident that in safeguarding Pakistan's territorial integrity and independence we shall have the support of all countries that condemn aggression, irrespective of their ideological affiliations. To oppose aggression, you do not have to subscribe to any particular ideology. Aggression is an evil for all states; it is an evil for all peoples whatever their beliefs or creed. If a crisis does come, we know that we shall have the sympathy and the support of all peace-loving nations of the world, and of all states that believe in upholding the Charter of the United Nations. Even if we are alone, we shall, with faith in the righteousness of our cause, face the crisis with confidence and, I have no doubt, survive.

Speech in the National Assembly on June 20, 1964

Flood in Sind—Foreign Policy—Kashmir Dispute—Pakistan an Ideological State—Afghanistan—Ceylon—Burma—Indonesia—People of Asia and Africa—Second Afro-Asian Conference—India—Communal Riots—Long Term Military Assistance to India—People's Republic of China—France—Turkey.

Mr. Speaker, at 8 O'Clock in the night I would not like to tax your energy whilst we are discussing taxation proposals. As I speak today upper most in my mind is the thought of the plight of my countrymen in the rain affected regions. Over the centuries, they have learnt not to cry; they have learnt to shed their tears in silence and today, Sir, while I address you, my countrymen are shedding their tears in Tharparkar, Sanghar and Hyderabad. They have been struck by a devastating and unprecedented flood. They are not concerned with the bounce of the tennis ball or with the shuttle cock of a Badminton racket. Today they stand poised between death and disaster. Who are these people? They, Sir, are the people who moved the first resolution in their Assembly for the creation of Pakistan. Who are these people? They are the people who shared their homes, their lands and all that they had with the teeming multitudes that poured in from India. Who are these people, Sir? They are the people who gave shelter to Humayun and produced Akbar in Tharparker, in Amarkot, a land which is devastated today. Who are these people, Sir? They are the people who had contributed, with all their energy and with all their ability, to the growth of Pakistan. They are the people who have shared in the miseries of the whole country. They have made handsome contributions in meeting the disasters in East Pakistan and other parts of West Pakistan. Today their homes are ravaged; their crops are destroyed; they are marooned; they are helpless. They ask us for help, they ask us for succour, they ask us for assistance. But they are shedding tears in silence, in the silence of the grave. These are your people, Sir, and these are my people. They have brought about the oneness of Pakistan, they have contributed to the growth of this country,

they have shared their homes not only with the refugees but with the people from all parts of West Pakistan as well as East Pakistan. They do not bellow out. They know the meaning of fortitude; they know the meaning of courage; and when we talk of financial assistance, of development projects, of importance of budgets, let us remember these unfortunate people, because the buoyancy of a budget and the value of financial policies can only be judged if you can save your own people from disaster and from destruction. These are the people of Tharparker, of Hyderabad, and of Sanghar. My heart bleeds for them because I am a part of them.

Sir, I would much rather be with them today than be addressing you here. But none-the-less the Budget debate is an important function, and I would appeal to the Minister for Finance to help these people who are in distress who have rendered their contribution to the greater glory of Pakistan, who have contributed to the integration of our country, who have given the best of their manhood for our people. It is the same people who were among the last vestiges of independence when the battle of Miani was fought against the British. It is the same people who, during 1942 and 1944, had paralysed the British administration in the sub-continent, and for the first time had Martial Law declared in their parts. These are the valiant people; they are brave people: they know the meaning of fortitude and they are bearing it well. But they expect from all of us the generosity and the sympathy which, I am sure, will be coming in full measure from this country. We will be failing in our duty, Sir, it will be a dereliction of our fundamental responsibilities, if we were not to give the maximum assistance to these people who are the most heavily taxed citizens of our land.

Sir, having said this much for your brothers and my brothers, for your kith and kin, for your blood and flesh, I would like to turn to the foreign policy of this country. Some Members of the Opposition have been critical of our foreign policy. They have said that we have not shared the secrets of diplomacy and foreign affairs with them. I wish they were here this evening to hear me. But they are not here, and I hope that they will be able to hear my voice, because my voice is primarily directed towards them.

Secrecy, Sir, means secret. When there is secrecy involved, it cannot be shared. This is a part and parcel of every administration. None-the-less, with all these limitations which are imposed by the rules of Government, we have shared with the Members of the Opposition our inner thoughts, and we would like to continue to share with them our inner thoughts, because we believe that the foreign policy of this country, or any other fundamental policy of this country, cannot be dictated from above. It cannot be arbitrary; it cannot be in isolation from the people. It derives its strength, its vitality, from the people. So this Government, like any other government, would like to have the unstinted support of the entire nation

for the implementation of its foreign policy, and we believe that we, who are today responsible for the government of this country, know the true interests of this country; and we would never betray by one iota, by one obol, the interests of this country. That is out of the question.

Sir, I would like to give an example. By way of illustration, you will recall that when the Government of Pakistan entered into bilateral negotiations, with the Government of India for the settlement of the Jammu and Kashmir dispute we were asked again and again to enlighten the House, to take the House into confidence, on the outcome of the negotiations. It was not possible to take the House into confidence while the negotiations were proceeding. But at the conclusion of those discussions, this House and the nation appreciated that the Government of Pakistan maintained the fundamental interests of the country, and we came out of those negotiations with one fundamental precept, with one fundamental concept, and that was that the future of Jammu and Kashmir will be only settled by the people of Jammu and Kashmir.

This has been our position from 1947. This remains our position today, and this shall always be our position. There can be no solution of lasting duration, which can be acceptable for all time, if it is not acceptable to the people of Jammu and Kashmir. Suppose, Sir, the Kashmir dispute did not arise in 1947. Suppose, Sir, it arose in 1962 or 1964; and if we were to wipe out the slate to write anew the whole situation, what would be the answer to the problem? Even today in 1964 the answer to the problem of Jammu and Kashmir would be to let the people of the State of Kashmir decide their future. So the future of Jammu and Kashmir can only be determined by the people of that state. This is not just a political proposition; this is an article of faith with us, and it shall always remain an article of faith with the Pakistani nation. This is not a party issue. This is not dependent on the judgement or on the power of individuals, and I would like to assure Mr. Chattha, who spoke of individual judgements, that, as far as the Government of Pakistan is concerned, we have always adhered to the basic principle of the right to self-determination in the solution of the Kashmir problem; and it shall remain our endeavour and our struggle that the solution of the Kashmir problem can only be arrived at equitably, honourably and on a permanent basis if it accords with the wishes of the people.

If there are any inhibitions and if there are any mental reservations I would request my friends to forget them. On the main issue of the solution of the problem of Jummu and Kashmir their interests, your interests, my interests and the interests of the hundred million people of Pakistan are identical *i.e.*, the will of the people of Jammu and Kashmir shall prevail and that the will of the people of Jammu and Kashmir is supreme in the determination of the dispute which divides Pakistan and India. Let

there be no doubt whatsoever on this issue.

For the last seventeen years we have struggled, we have fought, we have sacrificed, we have faced privations, we have faced challenges; Why? Because we refused to compromise with principles; and this nation shall never compromise on the principle of the right to self-determination of the people of Jammu and Kashmir. If we were interested in merely a solution of the Kashmir problem, we would have attained it many years ago. We can do it today also without any difficulty but it would be an unprincipled act. Therefore, despite the hazards, despite the difficulties, despite the vicissitudes involved in the situation we shall continue to struggle for the right cause, for a cause in which the people of Pakistan are wholly committed.

When I say the people of Pakistan I mean the people of East Pakistan as much as the people of West Pakistan. We take pride in the manner in which the people of East Pakistan have lent their unstinted support to the solution of the dispute of Jammu and Kashmir. It is a tribute to the people of East Pakistan that they have endeavoured, they have sacrificed as much, if not more, as the people of West Pakistan for the solution of the Kashmir problem. Sir, we hear that in India the people of the South are not as much emotionally committed to Kashmir as the people of the North. In India there may be a polarization on the Kashmir dispute, there may be a feeling in the North unshared in the South, but, in Pakistan, it is a national issue whether it is East Pakistan or West Pakistan, whether it is the far flung villages of Comilla and Sylhet or whether it is Lyallpur and Sialkot.

Sir, I have read with great interest the speech of Mr. Muhammad Hussain Chattha. I would like to congratulate him for his observations. He has spoken as a nationalist. He has spoken with feelings of a Pakistani. We share those feelings. I am sorry that he is not here this evening to hear me. Tell him that we also believe that to us our national self-respect, our sovereignty, our determination to remain independent and free people are more important than any other consideration. There are other important considerations too, vital considerations, those considerations which go to the stomach of the people, but above all these considerations there is the paramount call of duty where a nation in a crisis must choose between spiritual values and material values. We are confident that we shall progress; and we shall strive to attain material values also but this nation of Pakistan founded by Quaid-i-Azam is more wedded to spiritual ideals.

Sir, Pakistan is an ideological nation. It is a nation which believes more in the spirit, in those values which are paramount to human beings, which last for all times and are much more beneficial than transient material values. Therefore we shall for ever be committed to the spiritual and ideological growth of Pakistan. Nothing can supersede, nothing can rise above.

the spiritual aspects of Pakistan. I tell you, Sir, that if spiritual aspects were to be subordinated to pragmatic materialistic considerations then this nation will sink. But this nation can never sink because this nation is for all times committed to ideological and spiritual values.

When Pakistan was created we had a responsibility not only towards the hundred million people of Pakistan, not only towards those who inhabit this land of Pakistan, but also towards the world at large. Pakistan, being an ideological state, has not only national responsibilities but also international responsibilities which are as important as its national responsibilities. While we strive according to our dreams and according to our concept of life to attain equality of man as represented in the Budget and by other means, we have also to strive internationally for attaining the international homogenity of mankind. When the world is polarized into a conflict between the East and the West this is the nation which can make its greatest contribution to form a bridge between the East and the West.

I speak today as a Pakistani and perhaps I am partial, I am prejudiced when I say that we can be a bridge between the East and the West. But let me not express my own sentiments because I may be carried away by my own feelings and sentiments as a Pakistani. Let me revert to the pages of history. Was it not Goete, Mr. Speaker, who said that Islam is a bridge between the East and the West? And who was Goete? A German philosopher who had no vested interests, who did not rise from our soil like you and I did. He could not be prejudiced; he could not be partial. So it was Goete, a German philosopher, who said that Islam is such a catholic, such a universal religion that it can be a bridge between the East and the West.

In the process of the creation of Pakistan thesis is a milestone, the bed rock. When the Quaid-i-Azam and poet Iqbal conceived the ideal of Pakistan they could not have conceived of Pakistan as playing a national, a limited role in the world. Were that the case, we would not have sacrificed so much for the attainment of Pakistan. Millions of people would not have perished to bring it into reality. The presence of Pakistan is important because it not only creates brotherhood in our own confines but also in the international realm. When the people of Pakistan abhor and protest against apartheid it is not because it is good to do so in the present international situation but because it is an article of faith with them. We have no other alternative. It is not a question of power politics. We must do it and we have to do it because it is engrained in our ideology. Pakistan must oppose all forms of caste hatred, all forms of racial hatred and all forms of hatred among people who divide themselves on the basis of the rich and the poor, yellow and the white, brown and the white, black and the white, and haves and have-nots.

Islam permeates through all these prejudices and Pakistan as an Islamic state must permeate through all these prejudices and must support the cause of Africa in the fight against discrimination and in the fight against the domination and oppression of the black by the white. It is an article of faith with us. As a Muslim people, as a State which has an ideological background, we can do nothing else. When, Sir, Pakistan preaches the universality of the United Nations we do not do so out of the considerations of politics. Here also, we have no alternative because Islam is a universal religion; it believes in universality. Thus when we say that the Charter of the United Nations enjoins all states to be represented in the United Nations, it is not just a twentieth century norm or concept that we follow, a norm that nations have learnt to respect gradually, but because thirteen hundred years ago we were enjoined by our religion to preach universality.

Today when we ask for the representation of the People's Republic of China in the United Nations, it is not out of political consideration but because our religion seeks universality of the world. This is the spiritual aspect of our foreign policy. When, Sir, we as Pakistanis maintain that the world must be saved from the scourage and devastation of war, we do it not because we know that nuclear destruction is total destruction obviously, nuclear annihilation can render into nothingness everything that exists in the world, and many countries today preach peace because they know that the alternative to peace is total destruction-but because it is our duty to do so as Muslims. We must preach peace even if there is no nuclear power on earth. For us peace is an uncompromising precept of life even without nuclear destruction or nuclear forces.

Pakistan as an Islamic state must preach peace because Islam means submission to the will of peace and the will of God. Therefore, it is a part of our life, of our system to preach universal peace and universal tolerance. These are the two precepts of life and politics which we have inherited. We have not created them. From all considerations Pakistan has an important role to play, not only nationally, not only in the world of Africa and Asia, but, Sir, internationally; and by the grace of God, with strength and fortitude, we have been able in our modest way to progress towards these noble and lasting ends which are synonymous with Pakistan.

Sir, my friend Nawabzada Nasrullah Khan made some comments on foreign policy. He referred to our relations with Afghanistan. I would like to discuss this question in the context of our foreign policy and the role we have to play as a Muslim state. Afghanistan is our closest neighbour. Afghanistan is a Muslim state and the majority of the people of Afghanistan share the same faith with us. On our part we shall always try to maintain cordial, friendly and fraternal relations with the people of

Afghanistan. We share with them many affinities, historical, cultural and religious. We are proud of them. May be, there are differences which have been inherited as a colonial legacy. Colonialism has its own sinister ways of creating discord amongst friends and neighbours. However, now as an independent sovereign nation we would not be deceived by colonial machinations. It is necessary for us to defeat the objectives of colonialism. On our part, in Pakistan, we shall always endeavour to defeat those objectives, and not fall a prey to the interests of other powers.

We know the forces that interpose themselves in the establishment of good relations between Pakistan and Afghanistan. Those forces are not Islamic. They can never be Islamic because they strive to create discord and suspicion between the two Muslim brothers. These forces are aware of the consequences that would flow from a fraternal and homogeneous relationship between the peoples of Afghanistan and Pakistan. So, it is in their interest to try to create suspicion and discord between the peoples of Pakistan and Afghanistan. I repeat, we shall not fall a prey to these machinations; these are petty intrigues and it is for us to be generous enough, to be big enough, to be broad enough to face intrigues and to overcome them. We extend the hand of friendship to the people of Afghanistan on the basis of a relationship of lasting goodwill, amity and brotherhood because they are Muslim people and we are also Muslim people.

On our part we do not consider that there are any differences between Pakistan and Afghanistan, but even if there may be some differences they are not such that we cannot easily settle among ourselves. But we shall not allow third forces—outside influences, alien factors—to interfere with the relations between our two Islamic states. It is in consonance with these feelings, motivated by the highest considerations, that we restored relations with Afghanistan; and I am happy to inform the House that on our way to the Commonwealth Conference in London on the 5th or 6th of July we have been invited by King Zahir Shah to halt in Afghanistan and to be his guests. We have accepted this invitation. We hope that the visit would be a productive one.

We restored diplomatic relations with Afghanistan in 1963 and we also negotiated a transit trade agreement by which the Agreement of 1958 was renewed between the two Governments. There have also been exchange of visits between the Commerce Ministers of the two countries. In addition, the air services between the two countries have been renewed and expanded. With all these increasing contacts we hope that relations would further improve between Pakistan and Afghanistan.

There is another neighbour of ours, south of us, and that is Ceylon. You will recall, Sir, that in December 1963 our President visited Ceylon. We had a profitable and encouraging response from the Government of Ceylon

on various important issues. We agreed to settle the question of people of Pakistani origin living in Ceylon. In addition to that, I am happy to inform this House that the Government of Ceylon stated in the joint communique which was issued at the end of the President's visit that the question of Kashmir must be settled according to the wishes of the people of Kashmir. This is the first declaration that has been made by Ceylon on the subject and we in Pakistan regard it as a very important declaration. We think it is of very great significance because it comes from a neighbouring country, and it is only a neighbouring country that appreciates entirely the morality and strength of a nation's cause. So, we welcome this declaration by the Government of Ceylon that the dispute of Kashmir must be settled according to the wishes of the people of Kashmir, and we are thankful to the Government of Ceylon for taking a correct and moral position on an important international dispute between India and Pakistan.

There is another important neighbour of ours and that is Burma. During the course of the session we have had some discussion on the situation in Burma. I visited Burma in January this year and we held important discussions. They are in the process of undertaking a new experiment in their economic life and we are watching this with concern and admiration.

I am sure they are watching the developments in Pakistan with concern and admiration. We should also in that same spirit watch their efforts and have patience. Their intentions are to serve the people. We by our own methods and in our own way want to serve our people in the amelioration of poverty and misery, and they want by their method and in their own ways to serve their own people and bring a better life to them. The point I am trying to make is that we must be tolerant and have understanding of each other's approach. Neither my approach or your approach is entirely correct, nor their approach or others' approaches are wholly correct. There can be no hard and fast rule about such things. Everyone of us is embarking on exciting and challenging experiences, and we all have to answer the call of the people; and the call of the people is to remove poverty and to bring life for the people of Asia and Africa where new leadership has emerged. Leaders of Asia and Africa have been confronted with various problems. Let us admire their method of handling them as much as they respect our method of handling our problems. While we discussed these problems with the Government of Burma they assured us that the people of Pakistani origin will be given a generous treatment. They assured us that the Muslims of Arakan, although they were internally part of Burma's administration, will receive a fair and generous treatment. This, I think, was an honourable concession by the Government of Burma because it is a matter which concerned them exclusively. Nonetheless, out of a spirit of friendship, out of a feeling of good-neighbourliness, they told us

that they would see to it that the problem of the Arakan Muslims is settled amicably and equitably. They agreed with our Government to hold ministerial conferences on all issues which involve certain differences and certain misunderstanding between Pakistan and Burma. We readily agreed as it was a constructive and positive suggestion. We must evolve a machinery, a ready machinery, a proficient machinery whereby issues affecting Burma and Pakistan are immediately brought to bear at the ministerial level and resolved at the ministerial level. I think this is an important development. It will be favourable to both Pakistan and Burma.

We have also agreed with the Government of Burma to settle our boundary, a boundary which we inherited from colonialism. We have agreed to settle the boundary between Pakistan and Burma on the Naaf river. Hydrological work is in progress. This is another thorny problem which the Government of Pakistan have resolved with a neighbour of Pakistan.

Now, Sir, we come to a great country led by a great leader and that is Indonesia. Sir, our relations have grown over a period of time. In the past the Indonesian President has visited Pakistan on many occasions. He visited Pakistan before our revolution and there were joint communiques and there were declarations of various sorts before the revolution in this country, but on the question of Kashmir Indonesia remained non-committal. A major and important development took place recently when Indonesia came out categorically and clearly and without any doubt for the right to self-determination of the people of Kashmir and supported the hundred million Muslims in Pakistan in respect of the right to self-determination of the people of Kashmir. This I regard as an important and as a fundamental turning point in the situation in South-East Asia. On our part we shall always continue to maintain brotherly and fraternal relations with the people of Indonesia led by the great President Soekarno, and we shall promote the development of brotherly and fraternal relations between Pakistan and Indonesia, which will always be for the good of the region.

I would like to emphasize on this aspect of the matter. The relations between Indonesia and Pakistan can only produce good for the people of our sub-continent as well as for the people of South-East Asia. I say this because we also have friendly and good neighbourly relations with Malaysia, and Malaysia is a part of Commonwealth. We recognize Malaysia. We know the problems of Malaysia and we have informed the Government of Malaysia that as far as Pakistan is concerned we shall always seek to be a moderating influence, an influence for peace and goodwill between Indonesia and Malaysia. The people of Pakistan welcome the present negotiations that are taking place in Tokyo. With this dispute we have a deep concern. It affects two large countries belonging to our region in which the

majority of the people are of the same faith as we are. You will remember, Sir, that as a matter of fact the President of Pakistan had offered the leaders of Malaysia and Indonesia and Philippines the hospitality of our soil. They were invited to Pakistan to discuss their problems. As a nation friendly to all three countries we were prepared to assist in the process of normalization of relations between the three countries. That offer was appreciated by all the three Governments—Indonesia, Malaysia and Philippines. But they had already agreed to meet in Tokyo. The venue is not important, whether they meet in Tokyo or they meet in Pakistan. What is important is our intentions. And our intentions are that these three countries should resolve their problems in a spirit of amity and in an honourable way so that they can live in peace and make their fullest contribution to the growth of Afro-Asian solidarity to which they and we are committed.

Mr. Speaker, Sir, Pakistan's foreign policy is well-known to you. It is a foreign policy which is subscribed to ethical principles and to moral obligations. We have always maintained our position on these values, and one of the most important values that Pakistan maintains is the solidarity and the comradeship of the Afro-Asian world.

We consider that the future belongs to the people of Asia and Africa. For too long the people of Africa and Asia have lived in misery. For too long, Sir, they have been exploited. For too long they have not known the meaning of a good and decent living. We are a part of that system. We can never dissociate ourselves from that system. We have suffered as much as they have suffered. We may belong to Asia, they may belong to Africa, and the distance between us may be great but the systems have been the same. Those systems of exploitation have kept us away from the foreground of life, international life, and from bringing about peace and stability in the world. We, who have suffered like the rest of the people of Africa and Asia, must make our maximum and fullest contribution to the growth and glory of the people of Asia and Africa. It is in that context that we in Pakistan worked for the second Afro-Asian Conference. We believe that considerable progress was achieved from the First Afro-Asian Conference held at Bandung almost a decade ago. That conference achieved positive results. Now, with the liberation of many other countries in Asia and Africa, with many new leaders emerging with great talents, like the heroic people of Algeria, we feel that the time has come for a Second Afro-Asian Conference. This second Afro-Asian Conference can be a powerful and a decisive instrument in the consolidation of international peace. It can be a great factor in approaching the East and the West and also rendering to the world a great service on a humanitarian platform. It is for this reason that Pakistan has spearheaded the movement for a

second Afro-Asian Conference. At the Djakarta Conference, Pakistan made a valuable contribution. The Agenda for the second Afro-Asian Conference was tabled by the Pakistan delegation and that has been accepted in toto. Among the subjects that have been enunciated in that Agenda are the genocide of minorities and equality of all races and of all people. We look forward with eagerness to the Second Afro-Asian Conference and we believe that Pakistan, dedicated to fundamental and imperishable values of human dignity, will have a major contribution to make in the Second Afro-Asian Conference in co-operation and in conjuncture with many other Afro-Asian states. We believe that the time has come for the complete liquidation of colonial rule wherever it exists, whether it be in Africa or in other parts of the world. We believe that the time has come for complete and total disarmament so that people may live in security and in a sense of dignity and self-respect.

(*Interruptions*)

Now, Sir, I would like to touch upon our relations with India. I have already mentioned to you the importance Pakistan attaches to the world of Asia and Africa, and it is in Asia and Africa that the bulk of the Muslim people have their homes. So, when we seek to strengthen solidarity of Asia and Africa, we, in actual effect, promote the strengthening of solidarity of the Muslim world. But another important pillar in the foreign policy of Pakistan is its relations with its neighbours. We have restored, as I have already said, good neighbourly relations with Afghanistan. We have also sought to improve our relations with Ceylon, with Burma, with Nepal and with all our neighbours. But among the principal neighbours of Pakistan is undoubtedly India. With India we have an old and common history. We clashed where we had our differences. But can anyone deny that we have to live in the same sub-continent? We cannot transform and transplant a hundred million people outside this sub-continent. Nor can India transform and transplant its four hundred and fifty million people outside this sub-continent in order to overcome Indo-Pakistan differences. Indo-Pakistan differences must be settled among us in our own sub-continent. The fact that they exist is a tragic situation. The fact that they will continue to exist is a deplorable situation. The fact that they must be resolved with heroic endeavour is our strong belief.

We are the smaller country but the intitative has very often come from us. It should have come from the other side because India is the larger country. India is the country with greater resources. It has enjoyed, relatively speaking, greater stability than we have had. It is a country which, relatively speaking, has had a more enduring leadership than we have had. Nonetheless, the initiative has always come from us. Has this initiative been misunderstood? Is it possible that because the initiative has come

from us on every occasion it is being misconstrued? If that is the case, it is all the more painful, it is all the more tragic because we have not taken this initiative out of fear of being subjugated, out of fear of being the weaker party. We have taken this initiative because we believe in peace, because our ideology is dedicated to peace, because we believe that it is in the interest of the people of the sub-continent to live in peace with one another.

One of the reasons for the establishment of Pakistan was that as we could not live together as majority and minority communities, we should go our own ways, and by going our own ways we could come together as independent and sovereign peoples. We have always sought to do that.

Sir, India is a big country where over four hundred million people reside. As four hundred million people reside in that country, one has to tolerate and understand the various voices, that also arrive from different parts of India. Often we have heard it said that if India faces a crisis Pakistan will take advantage of that crisis. We have heard it said very often that the moment India faces a crisis Pakistan will take advantage of it. Now, we know unfortunately that when our Quaide-Azam died at that time advantage was taken of that crisis and Hyderabad was invaded. But when Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru died, which was the greatest crisis the people of India faced, the President of Pakistan ordered his Foreign Minister to go and pay homage to the great leader of India.

(*Interruptions*)

So, Pakistan did not take advantage, did not even conceive of taking advantage, when India faced its most serious crisis, and that is important, very important. All the irresponsible charges of collusion between Pakistan and our great neighbour China are rendered void in a situation like that, because more than words, more than eloquence of speech, it is conduct in a given situation which is the final answer; it is the testimony of time which is of the greatest importance and the most enduring consideration.

Thus we have shown with our conduct that we are prepared to settle our differences with India in an honourable way, in a way that the people of Pakistan would like to respond to. But, Sir, this does not mean that the people of Pakistan will surrender any on their legitimate sovereign rights. We are prepared to settle our difference on the basis of equality on the negotiating table, through the process of give-and-take, as we have done in the case of Afghanistan, Iran, Burma, Nepal and the People's Republic of China. We are willing and anxious to invoke the same procedures and the same practices with our great neighbour India. But India must note that it can only be on the basis of an equality of two independent

states, that it cannot be a dictation of one country to the other. Pakistan will never subject itself to dictation of any kind. It must be according to the norms of international respectability, according to the principles of good neighbourly relations, and according to the dicates and edicts of the twentieth century. We extend the hand of friendship but on a basis that is mutually agreeable, that is mutually acceptable and to the benefit of the people of Pakistan and India.

In this situation I would also like to mention the holocaust of communal frenzy and of communal riots. We have been appalled by this situation. We have no answer for what has happened in our country although we took the sternest of measures to put down communal frenzy and communal riots in Pakistan.

On the floor of the House I would like to pay a tribute to the Government of East Pakistan and the people of East Pakistan for the manner in which they curbed and suppressed communal frenzy. It was a tribute to them; it was a tribute to their spirit and their sense of generosity to curb and suppress communal frenzy.

(*Interruptions*)

When blood-bath takes place, when helpless communities on both sides suffer only because they belong to a minority community, it is a shameful condition. It was ironical history that Pandit Nehru before his death witnessed one of the greatest holocausts in the east of India. That holocaust appalls us. It appalls anyone with a sense of human consience. It was a terrible devastation; it was an organized orgy where ugly heads were raised by militant communal organizations. I would not like to dilate on those conditions because we are hoping to enter into a new phase and new era in our relationship. So, let me stop here and let me say that we should do everything possible in this country and in India to prevent the recurrence of such incidents. Let us not apportion blame or causes. Let us resolve amongst ourselves that this shall never happen again ; that the minorities in our country are a sacred trust of the people of Pakistan, irrespective of what happened in India. Each and every individual of the minority communities, whether Hindu, Buddhist or Christian, is our own responsibility and we must save and help them like we would save ourselves and our children. This is the meaning of Pakistan; this is the object of Pakistan; this idea is the flower of Pakistan.

We hope that during the Commonwealth Conference the President of Pakistan will have an opportunity to discuss outstanding problems and issues with the Prime Minister of India.

In our opinion, Sir, there is really one outstanding-problem and that is the settlement of the Kashmir dispute. All other differences and irritants

flow from differences on the Kashmir issue. I would not like to tax you at this time of the night and go back to 1947 to recall all the unfortunate and perverse aspects of this dispute. Let us for the moment forget the past; let us sponge it out; let us talk of the present.

On the 26th December, 1963 the unfortunate episodes took place in which the holy relic in Hazratbal was stolen. This was a terrible sacrilege and the people of Kashmir were appalled and disgusted by it. They rose in revolt. They expressed resentment and disdain over the situation.

(*Interruptions*)

Then, Sir, there was trouble. There was a chain reaction. That is our point of view on the subject. We believe that the Kashmir dispute is the core of the whole situation. If the Kashmir dispute remains unsettled, no matter what else we do, we can never achieve lasting peace. Even if we settle all other problems it would be shadow-boxing, playing with the periphery without a Kashmir settlement. We must therefore, tackle the main issue *i.e.*, Jammu and Kashmir dispute. This is our submission and our thesis. Let the, Government of India know that it is impossible for them to solve the problem of Jammu and Kashmir by the passage of time. The problem of Jammu and Kashmir cannot be settled by the passage of time. It is a part of Pakistan's philosophy and life. Pakistan is incomplete without Jammu and Kashmir. It is the moral responsibility of Pakistan, a responsibility which we have inherited from Quaid-i-Azam and Quaid-i-Millat, and from the creed of Islam. The Kashmir people are our blood and flesh. They must be given their inalienable right which was promised to them by the Government of India, by the leaders of India—that they must settle their own future. And on that right there can be no compromise, no political jugglery and no political settlement.

(*Interruptions*)

This brings me to the important and vital decision which has been recently taken by the American Administration on providing long term military assistance to India. You will recall, Sir, that we had protested to the Government of the United States of America against long-term military assistance to India. It is our view that long-term military assistance to India without the settlement of Kashmir dispute would only aggravate the tensions in the sub-continent. We believe that Pakistan and India are capable of tackling their disputes, the most important of which is the Kashmir dispute, between themselves. It can be settled bilaterally and multilaterally through the United Nations, but certainly *not* by injecting long-term military assistance to India. We feel that the problem of Kashmir will become more remote from settlement by this injection, and it would also aggravate the tensions between India and Pakistan.

In 1962, when the Sino-Indian clash took place, we were informed by both the American Administration and the British Administration that the assistance rendered to India was of a short term emergency nature and that, once the emergency was over, they would consider afresh their attitude towards the sub-continent and towards the requirements of the sub-continent, and also bear in mind Pakistan's objections. I do not want to state here the various details of the aid that has been given to India. Whatever that aid, so far it was on an *ad hoc* basis. But recently an announcement has been made that military assistance to India would be of a long-term nature. This stand is pregnant with far-reaching consequences. It affects the security and integrity of Pakistan. I believe there is an adjournment motion on the subject. So, I will not like to discuss this matter in detail at this time, but nonetheless it is an important development in the contemporary period of Pakistan's life. We have to take the fullest cognizance of the situation. We would like to improve our relations with India and we are anxious to improve our relations with India, but we do not feel that injection of long-term military assistance to India by the United States, an ally of Pakistan, would serve and render the better interests of India and Pakistan.

Having referred briefly to this situation, I would like now to take a few minutes of your time on our relations with two important countries. One of them is the People's Republic of China with whom we share a common frontier. Nawabzada Nasrullah Khan has stated in his speech that we have kept him and the members of the Opposition unaware of the boundary demarcation between Pakistan and China. I would like to say that this is not the correct position. The Government of Pakistan have kept the country fully informed on the outcome of the boundary demarcation between China and Pakistan, and I would like to repeat here that out of this boundary demarcation Pakistan gained seven hundred and fifty square miles of valuable economic territory. This has been stated before and I would like to repeat it here. Mir of Hunza who is more directly affected by this boundary demarcation congratulated the Government of Pakistan on the outcome and said that he never expected to get the salt ranges and the grazing grounds of Shimshal Valley. His ancestors never enjoyed this privilege. We know that this agreement on boundary demarcation was favourable to Pakistan and not unfavourable to the People's Republic of China. What is important is that by negotiations one party cannot have its way altogether. Negotiations obviously mean give and take. What is the alternative left to a modern sovereign state? Either to fight, either to destroy, either to decimate, either to ruin, either to obstruct for all times to come, or to negotiate on an honourable and equitable basis. Pakistan has chosen the path of peace, and Pakistan believes

in honourable and equitable solutions by negotiation. I would like to emphasize the words "honourable and equitable". If it is a peace with honour, we would prefer that over allowing our people to face sacrifices which are unnecessary; but if it is peace without honour, we would much rather fight. That situation is clear and simple. So, in the settlement of boundary accord with China, it is peace with honour, peace with dignity and peace with self-respect in which, through negotiations, we have settled the boundary between two important countries of Asia.

We have had subsequent developments in our relations with the People's Republic of China. It was in 1950 that the Government of Pakistan recognized the People's Republic of China as a reality, as an authority which had control over the main land of China. We have supported the admission of the People's Republic of China to the United Nations on the same basis. We are an ideological state. We have our own ideology. We have our own values. We have our own way of life. They have their own ideology; they have their own way of life. But we both are neighbours. We have lived together for centuries and in the future we will have to live together for all times to come. We cannot divide and parcel countries from Asia to Europe or from Europe to Asia. Good neighbourly relations are a fundamental aspect of Pakistan's present foreign policy. We must learn to live with our neighbours on a basis of understanding, accommodation and friendship, with honour and self-respect, and in mutual interest, which was enunciated at the Bandung Conference and which was supported by Pakistan.

There is another country, Sir, to which I would like to refer, and that is France. Between France and Pakistan relations have developed, and we hope that our relations will develop further. We are a part of Asia and they have a stake in Asia, and they have made certain vital pronouncements affecting Asia. Because of President de Gaulle France has found a great rejuvenation and resuscitation. We welcome and support that resuscitation and rejuvenation which, we think is in the interest of world peace and in accord with the ideals of equality among nations and friendship among all countries.

Finally, Sir, I would like to say that, in so far as Turkey is concerned, we share with Turkey an imperishable bond of faith. We were, I think, the only country that came out categorically, and without any hesitation, in support of Turkey's position on Cyprus. We did that not only because we share a common faith with Turkey but also because Turkey was an injured party. It is because of our common faith that we both took the right position. Turkey said that there was a constitutional guarantee, "pacta-santsavanta" was involved. Therefore the Government of Cyprus could not wriggle out unilaterally from its obligations which it had

undertaken as a sovereign state. We supported their position because it is a moral position and a correct position; it is the position which an Islamic state should support. The fact is that the positions of Turkey and Pakistan converged on the situation because our faith commands us to take the right position, and not because we were of the same faith. Turkey has appreciated the position of Pakistan; but we have not taken this position for the sake of getting appreciation. We believe in the value of friendship and in the system of alliances. Where there is the element of "give and take" there is also an element of sacrifice.

Mr. Speaker, Sir, I have taken a great deal of your time, and I am thankful to you and to the House for the patience and the endurance with which your have heard me. I would like to say before I conclude, Sir, that there comes a time for settlement, and there comes a time for a fight; there comes a time when we must resolve our differences, and there comes a time when we must fight for our differences. I think, Sir, as far as our neighbour India is concerned, the time for settlement has arrived. It is a time for us to put an end to our past differences, to turn our backs to the rancour which has divided us, and to reappraise the situation. The time is to-day. Tomorrow, Sir, may be too late.

Speech in the National Assembly on June 22, 1964

Global Policies of the Great Powers—Interests of Their Allies—Can There Be a Conflict between Them—Danger of Arms Aid to Uncommitted Countries—Interests of Pakistan—Need for Reviewing Policy.

I have heard with great interest the views of the various members who have spoken on this important adjournment motion. As I said the other day in an interview with the Press, the Government has made every endeavour to impress upon the United States its concern about the long-term military assistance proposed to be given to India.

At various stages, and on various occasions, right from the level of the President downwards, we have discussed this problem with our friends and allies. We have made known to them the dire consequences of the policy of giving long-term military assistance to India. If, as the members of the Opposition feel, we have not been able to convince our friends of the folly of pursuing this policy, it is not because of any lapse on our part; we have done our best. These members, I submit, do not fully appreciate our difficulties, for they have no experience of contesting the global policies of a great Power.

Before 1958, there was no occasion for the Government of Pakistan to come into conflict on policy matters with the great powers. On various issues, our policies were in consonance with the interests of the great powers. But destiny has brought about a situation in which it has fallen on us to differ on grounds of our national interests with the global policies of the great powers. We have sought in every possible way to make them realise and appreciate the serious and even dangerous consequences of the course which they are at present pursuing in our region.

I think it would be fair to say that a time does come when the debate must end and the dialogue conclude, when the nation must re-appraise and readjust it fundamental policies. Perhaps the time has come for Pakistan

to reconsider and to review its foreign policy, in the light of its basic national interests, in keeping with the changing circumstances. We have greatly benefited from the wisdom and advice of the members of the Opposition. It is only with a common approach and mutual understanding, that we can pursue meaningful policies with regard to our national interests. As I have said, the Government has gained greatly from this debate, and we hope to have close consultations with the Opposition and its leaders in the future, because these are matters which affect all of us equally.

Since the end of the last War, we have witnessed two important phenomena that have influenced the world. After the termination of the War, we saw the emergence of many independent states in Asia, Africa, Eastern Europe and we also saw the crystallisation of the ideological dispute between the free world and international communism. After the Sino-Soviet clash, that ideological conflict has today in 1964 become a little broader. But we hear—and we hear this from Soviet as well as Chinese leaders—that in the event of an international conflict, in the event of a nuclear war, the Soviet and the Chinese people will stand shoulder to shoulder. Thus we have witnessed two important phenomena in the world. One is the emergence of independent states in Asia and Africa, and in certain parts of Europe; and the other is the conflict between the two great Titans, holding different ideological values. We have also seen that the partition of states, necessary in some cases and unjustified in others, has led to tensions.

It is true that, notwithstanding the end of colonialism, some of its legacies have remained. Problems have arisen between new independent sovereign states; there have been boundary disputes and various other differences, such as claims against each other by former colonial territories. These are to be seen in Africa as well as in Asia. But, there is also a resolve on the part of Asian and African states to settle their differences by peaceful means. For instance, in Africa, we have seen that the Addis Ababa Conference has devised a machinery for the settlement of Inter-African differences. Between states that have resulted from partition, differences have been more acute. As far as our sub-continent is concerned, we fought for Pakistan, because we believed that its creation would lead to the permanent salvation and security of the people of our areas as well as the people of India. But there are in India some elements that never reconciled themselves to the division of the sub-continent. To be fair to the Indian Government, and to be fair to the former Prime Minister of India, I think, they had more or less reconciled themselves to the two-nation theory. But, nonetheless, there are powerful and militant organisations in India, which have not yet reconciled themselves to the partition. Not only are these militant organizations in India that are opposed to the two-

nation theory, and to the division of the sub-continent, but have been pursuing in their own ways policies to undo it. That is why we hear some people in India talk of a confederation for the settlement of the Kashmir dispute. Of course, the President of Pakistan made it quite clear in his recent speech at Peshawar that such a scheme would never be acceptable to Pakistan. But the fact remains that there are people in India who have not yet reconciled themselves to the creation of Pakistan as a sovereign state.

This is a basic factor in the problem. Powerful elements, believing in *Akhand Bharat*, are striving to bring about a merger of India and Pakistan. Some of these elements are of a militant nature; others employ peaceful, but nonetheless for us, dangerous methods. We have to contend with these elements. The State of Pakistan was achieved after great sacrifices and as far as its people are concerned there is no question about their will and resolve to maintain its integrity and sovereignty and to resist the machinations of those who want to destroy it.

The decision of the United States of America and other Western Powers to give military assistance to India is bound to encourage those elements in India which want to bring about a merger of the two countries, and to use military force and their power otherwise, to achieve their end. The situation, therefore, is a very serious one.

We call ourselves a developing country. Nonetheless, relatively speaking, we are a poor country and we cannot take upon ourselves the burden of acquiring additional arms and entering into an arms race. We must be true to ourselves, and admit that fact. While we cannot take upon ourselves that burden, the people of India cannot bear it either, because just as it will break our back, it will break theirs. Imagine that out of our budget allocation of three thousand million rupees we are spending over a thousand million on arms and in the case of India with a budget of thirteen thousand million they are spending ten thousand million on arms. This is diversion of national resources into unproducitve channels and is not fair to people who suffer misery and who are living in privation. This is not fair to our masses. This is not fair to the 80 per cent of our people who want a better standard of life. It is not a law of God that we should be poor and our people should suffer. The money which we are spending on arms could be better spent to improve the lot of our people. This new situation makes our task all the more complex. We should realise that with our pre-existing limitations, the present situation is going to retard our efforts to give a better life to our children and to our children's children. This is a vital consideration. But if we were to close our eyes to realities and say that we are not poor, that might satisfy our personal ego or our national ego, but that would be deceiving ourselves.

This arms race is going to lead to further aggravation of the situation

and create further tensions not only within the sub-continent but in Asia at large. I say in Asia at large, because Pakistan and India are important nations of Asia ; we are a hundred million people, and they are four hundred million people. The arms race between India and Pakistan is bound to have its repercussions in the neighbouring countries. The present development is detrimental and injurious not only to the interests of the people of India and Pakistan but also to those of the region as a whole. In addition to our national responsibility, we have responsibility for our region. We cannot and do not live in isolation. Ours is not a world which is comprised only of India and Pakistan. It is an international world. Pakistan and India are among the major nations of Asia. The policies that they pursue are bound to have wide repercussions.

Thus it is that the decision of the United States Administration to give long-term military assistance to India aggravates Indo-Pakistan differences and because these differences exist, the future peace of Asia is directly affected by it. These differences, we feel, can be resolved in a peaceful manner, through negotiation and in a spirit of conciliation. They are not insurmountable. With good will on both sides, India and Pakistan can resolve them. I am neither optimistic nor pessimistic. But it is a fact that we were moving in that direction, to some extent at last. True, we had not reached the end of the road. Far from it. But certain new developments had given us some hope that our endeavours might result in an improvement of the situation. Now, unfortunately, this decision with regard to long-term military aid to India does make our task more difficult. What were those developments? They were the release of Sheikh Abdullah, the situation in Kashmir itself, the realisation in India that it must settle its differences with Pakistan through negotiation, and that such a settlement was necessary in the interest of its masses. But just when events were moving in the right direction, came the announcement that the United States had decided to give long-term military assistance to India. I think it was meant as a sort of inducement to the Shastri Government, even before it was actually formed, to support United States policies. When the Sino-Indian conflict arose in 1962, we were told that United States and United Kingdom assistance to India was on an emergency basis and that it was being given because India faced a grave danger from China and it was not possible for the United States and the United Kingdom not to come to the assistance of India. But it was said that the aid was of an emergency nature, of an *ad hoc* character, and that it was to some extent linked with the settlement of the Kashmir dispute. We felt that the link should have been much more positive, that it should have been much more clear. But the United States and the United Kingdom argued that on this point between them and us there was only a difference of approach and that they would link Kashmir

in some way or the other with the military assistance they were giving to India. Thereafter at Nassau, as my friend Mr. Fazal Elahi has pointed out, the United States and the United Kingdom committed 120 million dollars worth of military assistance to India. Again, we were told that this measure was not of a permanent nature, that it was not based on a long-term policy but was merely a follow-up of the original emergency aid. Then again in 1963, there was a joint communique issued by Mr. Macmillan, then Prime Minister of the United Kingdom and President Kennedy committing further aid to India to the tune of sixty million dollars. In 1964, additional aid worth sixty million dollars was committed. Now we have the announcement that there is going to be long-term military assistance from the United States to India and that it would be of the value of about one hundred million dollars a year. This means a radical change in the situation.

Because of this change, the time has come for us to review our liabilities and our position generally. We had undertaken certain political commitments, but that was done in entirely different circumstances. The new situation is such that it would be on our part a dereliction of national duty if we did not, in the light of it, fully examine its political and military consequences. We must do this also in fairness to our allies, for even though they have been unfair to us we must be fair to them. Our national commitments are so heavy, the consequent responsibilities so great, and the threat to our security and integrity is now so serious that this Government would be failing our people if it did not reappraise its position, political and military. This does not mean that there is going to be any radical or basic change in our policy.

We cannot act irresponsibly. We owe a duty to our friends and we owe a duty to our people. But at the same time there is no denying the fact that the country does face a serious threat. We have to reckon with that fact and I am sure that in reckoning with it in a constructive fashion the whole nation will rally round the Government. I should also recall that recently an official of the United States Administration in his testimony before a Congressional Committee said that Pakistan would sooner or later adjust itself to the military assistance that was being given to India on a long-term basis in the same way as India had adjusted itself to the long-term military assistance that was given to Pakistan. Again, in order to be fair to our allies and friends, I think it right to say that in this regard they are suffering from a misconception, for there is a basic difference between the two situations. For one thing, as far as Pakistan was concerned, it was a member of certain alliances and had undertaken certain commitments. It was in lieu of those commitments and the obligations that followed from them that Pakistan became the recipient of military assistance from the United States. As far as India is concerned that is not the posi-

tion. The Indian Government has undertaken, as far as we know, no commitment and no obligation in regard to the military assistance that it is receiving from the United States. That is one difference between the two situations. The other difference is that India is four times the size of Pakistan. When Pakistan received military assistance from the United States, India almost rent the sky with protests against it. There was of course the fact that under the military assistance programme Pakistan had undertaken certain obligations. Now if India felt so seriously aggrieved about Pakistan, which had little resources of its own and which was one-fourth the size of India, receiving military assistance from the United States, one can well understand the feelings of our Government and people when India, which is four times the size of Pakistan, becomes the recipient of long-term massive military assistance from the United States and without undertaking any obligation whatsoever. These are the two differences in the situation. It must be recognized that these differences are of a fundamental character. Therefore, the question of reconciling ourselves to the situation does not arise.

The effect on the Kashmir dispute of long-term military assistance to India is far reaching. In the beginning, we were told that the *ad hoc* or emergency military assistance to India was in some way linked with the Kashmir dispute, that the United States and the United Kingdom would use their influence to persuade India to arrive at a settlement of that dispute. Gradually there has been a delinking of the Kashmir question from military aid to India. The official of the United States Government, whose testimony I just quoted, recently said that the global interests of his country in the sub-continent were of greater importance to it than the settlement of the Kashmir dispute. Now here we perceive a basic contradiction. What do global interests mean after all? The global interests of the United States must necessarily comprise the interests of its allies as much as its own. If there are any elements of common understanding, common appreciation and common obligations between the United States and its allies, then the interest of the allies, who have committed themselves to the United States, form part of the global interests of the United States. Surely, therefore, the United States must take into account the interests of its allies. Now, how can the global interests of the United States be in conflict with those of its allies? I cannot imagine that Pakistan's international interests—I shall not be so presumptuous as to say that we have global interests—can be in conflict with our friends. If that were possible, there would be no consistency in our respective moral or even political approaches to international problems. The United States cannot say that its global interests are in conflict with the interests of its allies and, if it did, there would be a basic contradiction in its position. My friend, Mr. Mashiur Rahman, had this in

mind when he said that for nations to be allies there must be an identity of purpose and a common approach to problems. If the global interests of the United States could clash with those of its allies and if they could clash with the basic national interests of Pakistan, then are we the only nation placed in that position?

It is not for me to say that Turkey and other nations also face similar serious situations. We see that at the other end of the alliance, the Turkish nation feels somewhat aggrieved, somewhat disappointed, at the lack of support from its allies on the question of Cyprus. As far as Pakistan is concerned, because of our alliance with Turkey, because of the imperishable bonds that we have with it, as soon as Turkey was confronted with the grave crisis in Cyprus, we came out uncompromisingly in support of the Turkish cause and rightly so. Alliances mean that there has to be a certain degree of give and take, not only in normal times but more particularly in times of crisis. We would have failed in our duty if we had not responded to the call of the Turkish nation for support in the Cyprus crisis.

Thus if Pakistan feels aggrieved, we are not the only people in such a situation. But where is the line going to be drawn? Either at the cost of our allies, we pursue our international interests or we abandon our allies. We cannot remain, much less can a great Power remain, on the horns of a dilemma. To change the metaphor, a great Power cannot ride two horses at the same time. Its own global interests must be consistent with the interests of its allies and friends who share with it common ideals and aspirations, and have undertaken certain obligations towards it. Or else, it must recognize that a new situation has arisen in which those alliances are no longer an asset, but rather a burden and a liability and consequently it must abandon the policy of alliances. But as I said, you cannot have it both ways. You cannot have a system of alliances and a system of betrayal of the interests of your allies. There must be consistency at least in this respect. I know it is said that consistency is a virtue of small minds. But here we are not playing with words. Here we are playing with the lives and the destinies not only of the hundred million people of Pakistan but the far larger population of the entire sub-continent, for this situation can escalate into something highly dangerous to them.

Because of this arms aid decision, we may find that the Kashmir problem has become all the more intractable and its settlement all the more difficult. I do not blame India altogether for it. After all, if India can get military assistance why should it not take it. Let India take it. But having taken it, India will discover the perils of the situation it is entering. However, that is a separate question. Although I do not put the blame so much on the Government or the people of India, I have no doubt that they will realize that in the long run the situation is really not to their benefit. Today we see

a militant India pursuing the policy of evicting its Muslim population from some of its eastern parts. But if India's military might is augmented to such an extent that it becomes still more formidable, it has to be utilized. But even if not utilized in action, by its very presence, certain things can be made to take place. An aggressive country does not have to resort to an armed attack. In fact, an armed conflict need not take place at all. It is not necessary that a physical attack should be launched against Pakistan, that guns should be turned against us. The imbalance of power, the disparity of strength between the two countries, would be so great that normally it could demoralize the weaker one. Of course the Pakistani nation is not easily demoralized. Nonetheless, in objective terms, disparity is undesirable, and I use the word disparity advisedly, because we know what can be achieved through it without the use of force. An aggressive superior Power does not have to use force. For instance, if a nuclear Power has any objectives to achieve against a non-nuclear Power, it does not have to use force. A situation may arise when India may seek to achieve its objectives, not by the use of force, but by the demonstration of force. And force has always been deployed by India against Pakistan. By demonstrating its formidable military might, India could pursue policies, which are not reconcilable with peace or with good relationship with Pakistan. If today we face a situation in which there is mass exodus of Muslims from India, we cannot be oblivious of these facts. We have to reckon with that situation, for we have a moral obligation to those people. That situation in its totality further tends to aggravate the problem between us and India.

We have heard our friends opposite say: "Why do you not take the question of the eviction of Indian Muslims to the United Nations?" We would have done so without a second thought if that were the answer to the question. We have studied the United Nations Charter and we know its limitations. The United Nations is not a superstate nor a supreme court. It does not issue edicts or writs, which are necessarily complied with. The Charter has its limitations and we know the pitfalls in taking such problems to the United Nations. In the final analysis, these problems have to be faced and overcome by us, the people of Pakistan. And what does that mean? If the two problems of Kashmir and the eviction of Indian Muslims remain unsolved and, at the same time through Western military assistance, India gets mightier day by day, so that there is no question of a balance of power between the two countries, that means a grim and bleak future for us. In that situation we must take a fresh look at our responsibilities.

Speech in the National Assembly on August 21, 1964

The Commonwealth Conference—R.C.D.—Muslim Evictees—Ceylon, Burma and Nepal—Kashmir—Relations with the United States—Cyprus Question—Relations with China—No Basic Change in Policy.

The Leader of the Opposition and his colleagues, who have spoken this morning, while basically not disagreeing with the Government's foreign policy, have, nevertheless, attacked it and have, as I shall show, made some statements which are without validity. They have also enquired what the rationale of our foreign policy was. They want to know how exactly we stand with regard to certain great powers. They have asked for a precise definition of our relations with the United States and a similar definition of our relations with the People's Republic of China. They said that in the past, *i.e.*, before this Government took over, they were clear about Pakistan's relations with those and various other countries, but that at present they were not clear about them. Let me explain the situation. Before this Government came into power, irrespective of Pakistan's fundamental and vital interests, the country was wholly committed as a satellite of a particular Power. This position was fully known. No matter what Pakistan's interests were and no matter how they were injured, the previous Governments had to toe the line laid down by that Power, and, as its stooge, even behave in a manner hostile to certain other countries. That was the position until 1958. The present Government of Pakistan follows a foreign policy, which is based only on considerations of the country's vital interests, such as its inherent needs of security and the welfare of its people, and on no other consideration. It is a policy which takes into account our paramount national interests, for whose defence the people of Pakistan, we know, will be ever ready to rally round the present Government and endure any hardships and make any sacrifices that are asked of them. We have developed normal and friendly relations with our neighbours, because that too is

in Pakistan's interest. Under the servile and senile policy, which was followed by the former regimes, no matter how Pakistan's interests were affected, they did not have the courage to deviate from their behaviour as a stooge and a satellite. In contrast with that, the present Government does not hesitate to disagree even with the great powers who are its allies, whenever Pakistan's interests so demand. Ours is a policy of self-respect and self-assertion. It is because of this fact that Pakistan's prestige has gone up in the world and particularly in Asia and Africa.

There was some reference to the Communique of the Commonwealth Conference. The Hon'ble the Leader of the Opposition said that we had made much of this Communique. I should like to present to the House the facts about it. It is not we who have made much of the Communique. On the contrary, it is India that has done so. India has been up in arms against the reference in the Communique to Indo-Pakistan disputes. In this context, I shall quote to the House the statement made by the Indian Information Minister, Mrs. Indira Gandhi, who was a member of the Indian Delegation to the Commonwealth Conference, just before she left London for her country. Question: "The papers have been carrying reports in the last few days that there is a strong movement in India now for getting out of the Commonwealth. We have known it; it was there all along. Presumably, your father in a sense kept India in. Do you think over ten or twenty years India will stay in or not?" Answer: "Well, it is very difficult to prophesy anything. There has been this movement since the beginning but this time there has been great resentment, if I may use that word, because of the mention of Kashmir (in the Communique). It has been a convention that no internal problems should be discussed (in the Conference), because (if they are) then you get involved in an *impasse*. And our Finance Minister, who was the Leader of our Delegation, Mr. Krishnamachari, foresaw this and really warned the Conference about it." Question: "Do you think the very fact that it was mentioned in the Communique may cause that kind of resentment and that would lead to India leaving the Commonwealth on that issue?" Answer: "Well, as you yourself have mentioned there is that resentment. I am not in India, so I only know what our papers have mentioned."

Now this statement was not made by or on behalf of the Pakistan Delegation. It was made by the Information Minister of India, who was a member of the Indian Delegation. In India itself, there was an uproar in the Congress Party and in the newspapers, which reflected the resentment in India on account of the reference in the Communique to Kashmir. We are not taking any credit for it, but the fact of the matter is that for the first time in seventeen years there has been anything like this reference. It was not a miracle, as the Leader of the Opposition has said, but, nonetheless, there must have been some cogent reasons for it. The House will recall that in

1951, Prime Minister Liaquat Ali Khan refused to go to London to attend the Commonwealth Conference until he was given an assurance that there would be some discussion on Kashmir, even though it be outside the Conference and informally. At that time, the mere fact that the Prime Minister of Pakistan was able to obtain such an assurance was regarded as a great triumph. In the present case, there was a reference to Kashmir in the Conference and a discussion about it in which seventeen out of eighteen countries participated, all supporting Pakistan. That I think is a matter, which is noteworthy. I hope that the members of the Opposition, even if they themselves are not willing to recognize its significance, will, at least, allow the people of Pakistan to do so.

In respect of the Istanbul accord, I have already made it clear that this is an agreement for economic, social and cultural co-operation and that nobody should unnecessarily read more into it. It is not necessary to take an agreement such as this, which is not a treaty, to the Parliaments of the contracting countries. This has not been done in Iran, or in Turkey, or in Pakistan. If it were a treaty, then the constitutions of the countries concerned would require it to be referred to their respective Parliaments. But this is an agreement, an economic, social and cultural agreement. As a matter of fact, we have in the past signed many economic agreements with other countries.

There is also an aspect of this matter which is of basic importance. The three countries that are parties to this agreement have, since 1955, been linked through a Pact together with certain other countries, which are not geographically or culturally connected with them. The new agreement, however, provides for co-operation in the economic, social and cultural fields in a meaningful and constructive way, outside the ambit of that Pact. In this respect the agreement represents a significant development. Let us assume that such an agreement had existed before the Baghdad Pact came into being and that it was confined to Iran, Turkey, Pakistan and Iraq. Then subsequently, even if the policy of Iraq had required it to leave the Baghdad Pact, that country would not necessarily have left the Regional Co-operation Agreement. In that case, our relations with Iraq would have remained warm and cordial, as indeed they are today, but our mutual collaboration would have been much greater. From that point of view also R.C.D. is important. Furthermore, we wish to see other countries of the region to co-operate with us in the economic, social and cultural spheres. Indeed, regional co-operation is possible between all the countries of our neighbourhood and ourselves. We have the advantage that while West Pakistan is adjacent to the Middle East, East Pakistan has geographical proximity with the countries of South East Asia. These countries, too, could participate in this or a similar scheme of co-operation. Thus wherever people are poor and need development, they could pool their resources

for the common good of all and through collective effort, obtain among other benefits, the benefits of modern technology. I think R.C.D. has great potentialities. Under it the 150 million people of Iran, Turkey and Pakistan will join hands and in due course other countries could also come in. All that we are anxious about today is to wipe out the stigma of poverty and to better the lives of our people and for that purpose to see that our resources are utilized to the best advantage. I am confident that the R.C.D. idea will evoke a sympathetic response in other countries as well.

We have been asked what the Arab reaction to this arrangement will be. What will be the reaction of China to it? Generally speaking, as far as the Arab world is concerned, its reaction so far has not been unfavourable. Some members of the House have referred to what are really cheap pamphlets published in certain countries. We cannot regard these as representative of responsible opinion, and nor is it fair to give a single quotation from one newspaper as an indication of the general attitude of the Arab world. You could, in any part of the world, pick up a newspaper which criticises every development. Let us not be misled by irresponsible journalistic reports. By and large, the Arab world has not reacted unfavourably to R.C.D. and we hope the Arabs will not take an adverse view of it, for there is nothing in it which is likely to prove injurious to them. On the other hand, if they give it proper and sympathetic consideration, they will find that they too may gain from this arrangement.

As far as the People's Republic of China is concerned, there has been a positive response on its part. It has welcomed this effort at regional co-operation and regards it an important landmark in Afro-Asian solidarity. This has been stated by the President, Prime Minister and Foreign Minister of the People's Republic of China. Now, if the whole world had approved of this regional arrangement, and there are in it germs of development for greater prosperity for the people of the countries that have joined it, I fail to understand why the Leader of the Opposition and his followers should be so cynical about it. It is understandable that because it is an accomplishment of the present regime, they must criticise it. But I do not think that they ought to carry their hatred of this regime to such an extent as to find fault even with beneficent things done by it, and thereby spread that hatred not only amongst the people of Pakistan but also those of other countries. The arrangement we have been talking about is an epochal achievement. The President of Pakistan played a magnificent role in bringing it about and he deserved the hero's welcome which he received on his return home.

The Hon'ble the Leader of the Opposition has been critical about our policy with regard to Kashmir. We are told that it is useless to negotiate with the Government of India. You will remember that when we had six rounds of negotiations with that Government, there was, in this House, a

hue and cry against them and the Government was condemned by Opposition members for entering into them. They themselves admit that there are only two ways of solving the problem of Kashmir, *i.e.*, either by war or by negotiation. The Leader of the Opposition recognizes that the cease-fire which came into effect in 1949 precludes the possibility of solving it by war. In any event, as a wise man and father of many children, he is conscious of the devastation a war can bring, and of the destruction of life and property that it can cause. He, therefore, discards war as a method of settling disputes and concedes that negotiation is the only way of settling them. But when we enter into negotiations, with equal force and eloquence, he deprecates our doing so. The only explanation of this attitude is that the Opposition must criticise and find fault with everything which the Government does. But from the practical point of view this attitude is wholly unhelpful. Furthermore, he enters a caveat with regard to negotiations. He says we must negotiate, but only on our own terms. Negotiations in themselves imply a spirit of give and take, moderation, conciliation and accommodation. He says, on the one hand, we should under no circumstances be moderate, conciliatory or accommodating; on the other hand he says that the Government of Pakistan should negotiate.

Actually, our basic difficulty with the leaders of the Government of India is also of a like nature. One of the reasons why India has not been able to settle its problems either with Pakistan or with any other of its neighbours is that the Government of India does not possess the spirit required for negotiation. Past experience has shown that India does not believe in the principle of give and take on a reasonable and honourable basis. That is why it has problems with Pakistan and problems with its other neighbours. Only recently, we hear, the High Commissioner of India in Ceylon addressed a gathering of Tamils and told them that the time would soon come when the Tamil language would have what he called its due place in Ceylon. That naturally caused consternation in that country. India seeks interference in the affairs of other countries and even seeks to impose its will on them. That has caused problems not only for us but for our neighbours as well. I should like to mention one particular problem. In so far as the eviction of Indian Muslims to Pakistan is concerned, India maintains that as a sovereign state it has the right to evict its Muslim citizens. It claims the right to unilaterally and arbitrarily declare that these Indian Muslims are not Indian citizens, but that they are Pakistan infiltrators. On this pretext they are thrown out from India into Pakistan. This is India's position as far as Indian Muslims are concerned. In the case of Ceylon, millions of Tamils, Indian citizens, have gone into that small island. India demands of the Government of Ceylon under no circumstances to treat them as Indian citizens. According to the Government of India, the Government of Ceylon has no

right, whatsoever, to say that these persons from India, who have been infiltrating into Ceylon for years, are infiltrators, and that all that the Government of Ceylon may do is to declare them stateless citizens. Now, when the Government of Ceylon asks the Government of India to negotiate the question of their status, the Government of India refuses to do so. When we ask the Government of India to negotiate a settlement of the problem of Muslim evictees from India—and their nationality and origin are ascertainable—the Government of India refuses to negotiate. When we say that there should be an international commission or some other body to help decide this matter, India refuses to agree and says it has the sovereign right to throw out these people from India on the basis of its own determination as to whether they are Indians or Pakistanis. When Ceylon asks India to negotiate, or to agree to the setting up of a conciliatory commission or some other machinery for the determination of the status of the Indians who have infiltrated into Ceylon, India declines and declares that the Government of Ceylon has no right to treat those people as Indian citizens. It is the application of these inconsistent standards which is responsible for the difficulties between India and its neighbours. We sympathise with the legitimate grievances of the Government and people of Ceylon. We must not forget that Ceylon is an important and friendly neighbour of ours.

So far as the evictions are concerned, we have offered to negotiate with India. We have proposed other means of settlement, such as some kind of machinery for conciliation. India has refused to agree to anything. These unfortunate Indian Muslims are being thrown into East Pakistan, which is a most densely populated area and already over-crowded. We just cannot afford to take these people in. The evictions are a form of economic aggression against Pakistan. Our patience is being worn out, and a time might come, unfortunate though it will be, when the situation deteriorates to such an extent that we are compelled in the interest of our own survival to act on the principle of an eye for an eye and a tooth for a tooth.

I shall now pass on to refer to the after-effects of the nationalisation laws adopted in Burma. As a consequence of those laws, we have had to make certain adjustments in our relations with Burma in the interest of our own people in that country. But this was done in a spirit of understanding and co-operation with the Government of Burma. India, however, showed no such spirit. It violated the new nationalisation laws of Burma and converted its Embassy in Rangoon into a bank, a depository of the wealth of its citizens in Burma. The result was that relations between Burma and India worsened. We, in Pakistan, agreed to a solution of the Nef river problem with Burma in a spirit of give and take. In an identical situation, India has refused to do so, and its Nef boundary with Burma remains unsettled.

Relations between Nepal and India may now be improving. We certainly

hope that they would improve. In the past, however, relations between these two countries were bad and India took every opportunity to interfere in the internal affairs of Nepal. Thus in trying to understand India's attitude towards Pakistan, it is necessary to appreciate the mentality and approach of India, not only towards Pakistan, but also towards its other neighbours. Pakistan is the most important of India's neighbours, if only because India regards Pakistan as its Enemy Number One.

This brings me back to the question of Kashmir. That question has to be looked at in the context of the overall position to which I have referred. There have been certain important developments in regard to Kashmir. Sheikh Abdullah has been released from jail. We have been told not to claim any credit for it. We have not claimed any credit for it, but the fact of the matter is that our efforts in the United Nations did help in some ways. We did not entirely precipitate the events that led to the release of Sheikh Abdullah though his release was, at least to some extent, connected with our taking the case once again to the Security Council. But we are not trying to seek any credit for it. However, Sheikh Abdullah's release has, undoubtedly, given a new aspect to the Kashmir situation. We have been watching with great interest and with deep concern all that is happening in Kashmir. The Indian Government has suggested that our President should meet Prime Minister Lal Bahadur Shastri to negotiate a settlement of the Kashmir dispute. We are always ready and willing to negotiate with India our outstanding differences, but for negotiations to be productive of results, it is necessary that there should be a change of the heart in India and some evidence of India's willingness to settle the Kashmir dispute. A meeting at the Summit always arouses a considerable degree of hope and expectancy. People expect something concrete to emerge from a Summit Conference. It was for this reason that in 1962, when it was suggested that there should be a Summit Conference between Prime Minister Nehru and President Ayub, we took the stand that it would be preferable to have first a meeting at a lower level in order to clarify the issues and define the ground rules. That is why negotiations on a Ministerial level were in the first instance undertaken. We still abide by that approach. A Summit Conference should take place only when there is some indication of progress, if not of a complete settlement.

Thus we feel that it would be preferable to have a meeting of Ministers again to prepare the ground for a Summit Meeting. But that should come if there is a sincere desire on the part of India to reach a settlement with Pakistan. Are there any indications of that? One fails to see any. If there had been such a desire, India would not have resented an innocuous reference to Indo-Pakistan disputes in the Communique of the Commonwealth Conference. There are no indications except the speeches that have

recently been made. But speeches have also been made in the past.

The economic situation in India is deteriorating rapidly. We are concerned about it because it involves the fate of people who have shared with us a common past. Poverty in itself is a terrible thing. But now we hear of hunger stalking India, and of starvation and food riots in that country. This situation is most deplorable, and we would be happy to see a speedy end to it.

India has a large population to feed. She has more than 400 million people. We fail to understand why, when its own population is starving, India should take on the added burden of the four million people of Jammu and Kashmir. It should release these people from its colonial rule, so that they can associate themselves with Pakistan and get a release also from the misery of want and hunger. If India did that, it would be relieved of a great liability. In any event, the destiny of those people is linked with that of Pakistan.

Unfortunately, colonial powers are always reluctant to liquidate their colonies. This is shown by the history of colonialism all over the world. Only recently when I made a comparison between India and Portugal, based upon an objective analysis of their respective positions, the Indian Press indulged in all manner of slander against me. Well ! They may continue to do that. They may continue to attack me until the cows come home. But there are certain facts that are undeniable. We know that the British have liquidated most of their colonies; the French have done the same; the Dutch have done the same; the Belgians have done the same. Only Portugal and India retain colonies. Portugal retains Mozambique and Angola ; India retains Jammu and Kashmir. One of the reasons why India and Portugal are on bad terms is that they are competing, each to retain its colonial domination. And this is no criticism of India. On the contrary, it is only a statement of facts.

We hope that the international situation and the basic interests of India will compel its Government to come to a settlement with Pakistan. On our part, we will continue to strive for an honourable and equitable solution of the Kashmir question. Let me tell this House that we shall never tire in our efforts to secure for the people of Jammu and Kashmir their right of self-determination. This is our national duty and a national obligation which Pakistan has to fulfil.

Reference has been made by some members to our relations with the United States and with China. As we have often said, we do not like the deterioration that has taken place in our relations with the United States; but it is not something of our doing. We have many interests in common with the United States. That country has contributed greatly to the economic progress of our people. Whatever our failings and faults, we are not an

ungrateful people. We are mindful of what Americans have done for us. We, on our part, have never wavered in fulfilling our obligations to them. But, unfortunately, there has come about a freakish situation which has caused some strain in our relations with the United States. It has been imposed upon us. As I said at the very outset, nothing is more important to us than the preservation of the interests of Pakistan and its people. We shall continue to regard that as our primary obligation. We hope that the Government and the people of the United States will appreciate the difficulties confronting our country.

We have been given assurances by the United States that in the event of aggression against Pakistan, the United States will come to Pakistan's assistance. However, in practical terms, this assurance, which I have no doubt has been given with good intentions, is one of doubtful value. As I said in a previous session of this House, it is very difficult to determine who is the aggressor and who is the victim, especially in modern warfare. By the time the question is debated and determined, the carnage will have taken place and all the damage will have been done.

Will the United States be in a position to make the assumption that India is the aggressor and Pakistan the victim? Furthermore, what kind of assistance will the United States be prepared to give us? Will it be withdrawal of economic and military aid to India; or will it be economic sanctions or some other action in the United Nations? Or is it to be a NATO type of assurance that aggression against Pakistan will be treated as aggression against the United States? In addition, will the United States be willing to guarantee not only Pakistan's own frontiers but also those of Azad Kashmir? As far as we are concerned, the destiny of Kashmir is linked with our's and, therefore, it is imperative that Azad Kashmir should also come within the scope of that assurance. These and other considerations have to be taken into account. It is not that that we do not want to overcome the present difficulties, but the situation is grave as well as complex and we cannot accept any illusory assurances. We cannot lull our people into a false sense of security. To do this would be to practise deception on them. It would be much better to squarely face the crisis in our relations with a powerful and mighty ally than to deceive our people into believing that the assurance given to us is enough to safeguard our national sovereignty and other interests.

We have seen in the case of Cyprus, as the Leader of the Opposition has pointed out, that military assistance provided by the United States to Greece and Turkey was used by both those countries against each other. This is a most recent example which demonstrates that, from a practical point of view, such assurances cannot really be meaningful.

With regard to the Cyprus question itself, we are happy to note that

there has been some helpful development and we hope and pray that a satisfactory solution of it will soon emerge. We are, however, surprised at India's attitude in the matter of Cyprus. In the past, India used to preach and even seek to dictate what was good for the world. But of recent years, India has been rather shy and reticent. We have seen that on the question of Viet Nam, although occupying an important position as Co-Chairman of the International Control Commission, India has been altogether silent. In the case of Cyprus, however, the Government of India promptly came forward to offer sympathy and support to the Government of Makarios, thus confirming the common aim of the two governments. The Government of India is engaged in the liquidation of the Muslim minority in its territory; the Government of Makarios is engaged in the liquidation of the Turkish Muslim minority in Cyprus.

In respect of our relations with the People's Republic of China, some members of the Opposition have said that circumstances have so conspired that those relations have improved. Let us give the credit for that improvement to circumstances. Obviously, circumstances must have the effect either of leading to success or failure. In the past when they were in power, circumstances were against them and they failed. Now circumstances have helped us and we have succeeded. However, our relations with China are not of a negative character. They are not based only on the fact that China has a dispute with India and we have a dispute with India. That is not the basis of Pakistan-China relations. They are based on positive factors. China is a close neighbour of Pakistan, with a common boundary of almost four hundred miles. As a small country, we believe that the United Nations cannot be strengthened without the presence of China in it. You cannot hope for the rule of international law with seven hundred million people debarred from participation in the United Nations. That is why we have supported the admission of People's Republic of China into the United Nations. It was wrong of the Hon'ble the Leader of the Opposition to say that we did that only last year. As you will recall, Sir, in the year previous to the last year, you yourself, as a member of our Delegation to the General Assembly, cast a ballot in favour of the admission of People's China. We believe that China should be admitted to the United Nations, because without it international law cannot really be reinforced. We also believe that without China's participation in the United Nations, you cannot bring about a permanent and lasting settlement of disputes in South East Asia. We believe too that you cannot have meaningful and constructive disarmament, that is general and complete disarmament, which is the cherished goal of all, so long as the People's Republic of China, representing seven hundred million, is absent from the United Nations. We are a part and China is an important part of Asia and Africa. We shall collaborate with China and

with all other peace-loving countries for the promotion of the solidarity and welfare of the people of Africa and Asia, and for the liquidation in these countries of the forces of colonialism and its ramparts still maintained by Portugal and India. We shall collaborate with all those countries which believe in the salvation of the people of Asia and Africa, and China is a most important one of them.

Nothing will give us greater satisfaction than to see the eventual, I would not call it a settlement, but a recognition, of the realities of the situation as between the United States and China. A breakthrough in the difficult, though somewhat artificial situation, between those two great powers is urgently called for. If it could come, that would be the most important single factor conducive to international peace and security. In the realisation of this objective, Pakistan will be ready to play whatever modest role it can. We are not saying this in a spirit of presumption. We know that world conditions require that at a certain stage there must be some relaxation in the tension between the United States and China. The present situation cannot last for long. Because of the *impasse* between them, the people of the United States and the people of China are the losers and, indeed, the people of the whole world. The forces of history and the compulsion of events are bound to move irresistibly. It is wrong to say that a *detente* or good relations between the Soviet Union and the United States are in the interest of world peace and at the same time to maintain that the isolation of China is in the interest of world peace. These double standards are obnoxious and cannot be applied to diplomacy in this second half of the twentieth century. We hope that slowly the force of reason and the processes of negotiation and accommodation will bring themselves to bear upon and lead to an improvement in China-United States relations. I repeat, we will be willing to undertake whatever limited role we can play in this matter.

Before I conclude, I wish to state that the present foreign policy of Pakistan is predicated and based on only one consideration, and that is the security and the well-being of the people of Pakistan. There are no other considerations. We are not willing to sacrifice the basic interests of Pakistan, no matter what advantages—illusory, false, superficial advantages—which any other considerations might bring. We are not boasting that our foreign policy is independent, because we do not like the application to it of cliches and labels. All that we would say is that without making any alteration in the basic structure of the foreign policy of the country, we are pursuing it with self-respect. On the same basis in the past, they pursued a foreign policy of subservience which deprived Pakistan of all prestige. In order that there should be some independence in our policy, there are those who want us to leave the Pacts. They should know that we have achieved

that independence without making the change which they advocate. To those who are opposed to a basic change, and at the same time do not mind subservience or dependence, we say that there will be no such change, and, while our policy will be conducted under an umbrella, it will be without loss of dignity or independence. To those who tell us that we can follow an independent foreign policy only by making a change in our alignments, we say that in the dynamics of the twentieth century, we can pursue an independent policy without making such a change. The present Government has served the interests of Pakistan with courage and fortitude, but without altering the basis of the country's foreign policy. But if a basic change becomes necessary in the interest of the country, that change will be made.

Speech in the National Assembly on July 13, 1965 (Morning Session)

Vietnam—Malaysia—Afro-Asian Conference—Consortium Meeting

Since the dissolution of the last National Assembly of Pakistan and the formation of this one after the general elections in the country, many important and rapid developments have taken place in the world—developments which concern Pakistan vitally. In these months we have had the visit of the President of Pakistan to the People's Republic of China and the Soviet Union. The Commonwealth Conference has also taken place and the important events that took place in Algeria necessitated the postponement of the Second Afro-Asian Conference. On his way to London, the President stayed in Cairo for two days on the 14th and 15th of last month. He was able to have useful discussions with the President of the United Arab Republic. On his return from London the President again stayed in Cairo for a day to hold important discussions with President Gamal Abdel Nasser of the United Arab Republic, Premier Chou En-lai of the People's Republic of China and President Ahmed Soekarno of Indonesia.

It is not possible for me to cover each and every aspect of our foreign relations. Not only is it not possible but the rules of diplomacy and propriety preclude discussion of certain matters. I can, however, assure you that, as far as is possible, we intend to take the House, our supreme legislative body, into confidence. No policy and particularly a foreign policy can succeed if it does not have the overwhelming support and sympathy of the people of a country. We are very mindful of this position. The foreign policy of Pakistan has always tried to reflect the will and the aspirations of the Pakistani people.

As far as the President's visits to China and the Soviet Union are

concerned you have doubtless read the joint Communiques. They are self-explanatory. The points of solidarity and common agreement have been reflected in these communiques. The visits have undoubtedly consolidated our relations with the People's Republic of China as well as vastly improved Pakistan's relations with its other powerful neighbour, the Soviet Union.

In so far as the Commonwealth Conference is concerned I would like to confine myself to two aspects of that Conference. Firstly, there was the Wilson peace mission on Vietnam. Prime Minister Wilson was of the view that something special, something extraordinary, had to be done to seek ways and means of bringing to an end that unfortunate conflict. He proposed that a mission of Commonwealth leaders from Asia and Africa with himself as the Chairman should seek avenues of a peaceful and an honourable settlement of this unfortunate war and conflict in Vietnam. There were some difficulties in the composition of the mission as well as in the realisation of its objectives. Noting these difficulties, Pakistan was not prepared to be a member of that mission although we sympathised and were in full accord with the aims of the mission. Yet for certain procedural reasons, we felt that the mission would have an uphill and perhaps an unsuccessful task to perform. However, we did endorse the idea and assured the Prime Minister of the United Kingdom and other members of the mission that Pakistan would try to facilitate the work of the Wilson mission. The Commonwealth Presidents and Prime Ministers were keen that our President be the Chairman of this mission and when he declined they proposed that he be a member of the mission. He declined that also for the reasons that I have stated. Time has shown that insuperable difficulties did interpose themselves to prevent the mission from coming into operation.

The other matter which I think would interest the House is the attitude of the Commonwealth leaders to the Malaysia-Indonesia dispute. I would have preferred not to make mention of this problem if there had not been a debate on it in the House of Commons. In the House of Commons a member of the Opposition—a former Minister of the United Kingdom in the Conservative Government—made some references to Pakistan's attitude to Malaysia and expressed his disappointment. The Prime Minister of United Kingdom agreed with him and also expressed disappointment. It, therefore, becomes necessary for me to clarify our point of view on this issue.

Malaysia is a neighbour of Pakistan. It is close to the eastern half of Pakistan where the majority of our people live. We have a vital stake in the peace of Asia and particularly in maintaining peace in a region which is so close to us. When Malaysia came into being Pakistan recognized it. We sent an envoy to Malaysia and they reciprocated by sending an envoy to

our country. Our trade with Malaysia has grown over the years and so has our political contact grown with time. We wish the people of that country well. The majority of them are Muslims having a common faith with us. But, at the same time, we have an abiding interest in the peace and future of the Republic of Indonesia which comprises a hundred million people, the majority of whom also share the same faith as that of Pakistan. Over the years, we have made strenuous efforts to improve relations with Indonesia. We feel that there is an element of common understanding and common appreciation. We share similar aspirations and similar problems. We are happy that our relations with that great Islamic Republic have improved enormously in the years. We will continue to make strenuous efforts to further consolidate our relations with Indonesia.

We have vital stake in the preservation of peace in our region as well as in the promotion of friendly relations between Malaysia and Indonesia. We support an honourable and peaceful settlement of the Malaysian-Indonesian dispute, the continuance of which pains us greatly. The first reason is their proximity to us. Secondly, we have common faith, common aspirations and a common cultural background. So we are deeply concerned. But this concern we can manifest in a positive and a constructive way by trying to bring about reconciliation between the two States, reconciliation between our two friendly and fraternal countries. This we will not be able to do if we take a partisan position or if we support one country against the other.

Now, this year an attempt was made to incorporate in the Communique a reference expressing the Commonwealth Presidents' and Prime Ministers' sympathy, and support to the Malaysian Government in the defence of its territorial integrity. We pointed out to our Commonwealth colleagues that it would not be possible for Pakistan to endorse such an undertaking because this would clearly exhaust Pakistan's utility in trying to bring about a friendly and peaceful settlement of the dispute. If we were to take a partisan position then it would not be possible for us to play the role which we hope we can continue to play. Whether we succeed or not is a different question, but what is important is that we hope to continue to play a positive and constructive role to restore peace between these two countries. Therefore, it was not only in their own interest but in the interest of Commonwealth States that Pakistan did not identify itself, merge itself with a particular point of view. We told the Commonwealth leaders that the position was all the more embarrassing because in this case there were three or four Commonwealth countries giving military support to Malaysia with a sizable contingent of their forces on Malaysia's soil. They are providing Malaysia with military assistance. Australia is providing military assistance and so is New Zealand. Now if Pakistan were to

sympathise and support those countries which are giving military support to Malaysia it would have meant that we not only identified ourselves with Malaysia's point of view but that we were prepared to give military support to Malaysia against another Muslim country of 100 million people. That we simply could not do.

Secondly, we said that such a support would mean entering into a military commitment, entering into a military alliance. Pakistan cautioned the other Asian-African countries of the consequences of entering into a military commitment. For that reason the other Afro-Asian countries agreed with our point of view and the reference to Malaysia was amended. It was not amended ideally, not as much as we would have liked, but, naturally, we could not dictate the terms of the Communique. In so far as our vital interests were concerned, we had to protect them and I think, we protected them adequately, so much so that, on an objective reappraisal, the Malaysian authorities as well as the Indonesian authorities should be mindful of the constructive role we played in this respect. We remained neutral in the interest of the future relations of both these countries. That is the background to this Communique and the reference to Malaysia in the Commonwealth final statement.

I would now like to place before the House the events connected with the Afro-Asian Conference. About two years ago, President Soekarno sent a special envoy to Pakistan and put forward the suggestion to our Government that the time had come for a Second Afro-Asian Conference. You know, Sir, that in 1955, twenty-nine Afro-Asian States met at Bandung and the germs of Afro-Asian solidarity were laid. About two years ago President Soekarno sent a special envoy to our President and to other Afro-Asian States with the suggestion that since many important events and developments had taken place in the world of Asia and Africa, new countries had emerged as independent states and new leaders had taken over the responsibility of their peoples, the time had come for the leaders of Asia-Africa to meet once again. Pakistan examined this suggestion carefully and considered all the implications of another Afro-Asian Conference. Eventually we agreed to support the Second Afro-Asian Conference. Pakistan had sponsored the first Afro-Asian Conference also.

Last year at Djakarta we had the preparatory meeting of Afro-Asian countries. Pakistan was one of the 14 or 15 countries represented in the preparatory conference. The sponsors of the first Afro-Asian Conference as well as certain other countries of Afro-Asia participated in the Foreign Ministers' Conference at Djakarta a year ago to prepare for the Second Afro-Asian Conference. At this meeting of Foreign Ministers, Pakistan did take many initiatives. In our humble way we made a contribution to the Second Afro-Asian Conference. The draft agenda for the conference was word

for word drafted and submitted by Pakistan, and the agenda for the Second Afro-Asian Conference would have been the agenda which Pakistan proposed at the preparatory meeting. We had certain important reasons for promoting the Second Afro-Asian Conference. I shall refer to them later. However, at this point I would like to say we have taken an intense interest in the promotion of the Second Afro-Asian Conference and we are happy and proud to have done it. The Conference will be held ; it shall be held *Inshallah*, it will be held with great success. After the preparatory meeting was over we armed the Standing Committee with the responsibility to meet regularly at Algiers, which was chosen as the venue for the Second Afro-Asian Conference. The Standing Committee was armed with the task to work out the day-to-day routine arrangements for the conference. It was to deal with various other questions which had to be sorted out for the Foreign Ministers' Conference which was scheduled at that time to be held in March but was subsequently postponed to June 24. The Standing Commitee was brought into being to prepare for the conference, to make all arrangements for the conference to take place and to facilitate the work of the Foreign Ministers by leaving as little as possible by way of disagreement and controversy for the Foreign Ministers to determine. So the role of the Standing Committee was a very important one. In the continuity of the Standing Committee lay, to a great extent, the success of the conference. It had to lay the foundation and prepare the ground-work for the Foreign Ministers' Conference, and thereafter, for the Summit Conference. I must pay tribute to the excellent work that had been done by the Standing Committee. It discharged its onerous and difficult responsibilities with great skill and efficiency. The fact that the conference was not held was not within the scope and purview of the Standing Committee's responsibilities.

From London we were to go to Algeria, and I was to go to Algeria on about 23rd of June for the Foreign Ministers' Conference scheduled for the 24th. The President was to follow on about 27th or 28th for the heads of the states' meeting on 29th June. On the 19th of June we received the information that there had been a *coup d'etat* in Algeria and that President Ben Bella had been replaced by Col. Boumedienne, his Minister for Defence. Col. Boumedienne had taken over the control of the country. This was an unexpected development; an internal upheaval had taken place in the country which was to be the venue of the conference for over 55 heads of states and governments. Immediately a number of questions arose, the question of practicability of holding the conference, the question of recognition of the regime by participation in the conference, the question of security, and very many other allied problems. All these immediately came to the fore and had to be considered and determined

before participation could be possible.

As the events unfolded themselves the element of uncertainty and insecurity became greater. A number of African States declared that they would not go to the conference. They contended that a change in Algeria was against the OAU Charter—the Organization for African Unity. This is a matter of interpretation. Some states opined that the OAU Charter was opposed to any violent or illegal change of government, that such changes would not be recognized by the organization of African states. Those states took the position that they would not attend the Afro-Asian Conference because the changes in Algeria were a violation of OAU Charter. They asserted that by attending the Conference they would be endorsing an event contrary to the Charter of the OAU. Subsequently, other countries also joined them and declared that they would not attend the conference because a revolution had taken place in Algeria.

An important aspect of the Afro-Asain Conference is its universality—the representative character of the Afro-Asian Conference. When we found that a number of African states had declared that they would not attend the Conference, we felt that another new snag had developed. This necessitated a meeting of the Afro-Asian leaders who were attending the Commonwealth Conference in London. The revolution in Algeria took place on the 19th and on the 21st Afro-Asian leaders attending the Commonwealth Conference met amongst themselves to discuss the developments in Algeria and to try to come to some form of understanding and common approach. After having discussed the problem in all its facets, the Afro-Asian Presidents and Prime Ministers were of the view that they should make an appeal for postponement. Now, I would like the House to carefully note that it was an *appeal* in which Afro-Asian leaders said they would *prefer* the Conference to be postponed. First of all it was an appeal. Secondly they only said that they would prefer the conference to be postponed in view of the developments which were self-evident and which could not be surmounted in so short a period of time. Thereafter, a special representative of the Algerian Government came to London to hold discussions with the Presidents and Prime Ministers attending Afro-Asian Conference. While he was holding these discussions with us we were receiving reports of riots and of demonstrations in Algeria. These developments were pointed out to the special representative and although he represented his Government's position, to be fair to him, he appreciated our difficulties also. It was finally decided by the Afro-Asian Presidents and Prime Ministers that there was no cause or reason to change the decision which they had taken. Nonetheless, Pakistan initiated another meeting of the Afro-Asian leaders on the 23rd and held further discussions with the special representative of the Algerian Government. Even

then the Presidents and the Prime Ministers were adamant and they said that all events subsequent to the initial decision had only strengthened and fortified their assessment of the situation. This notwithstanding, on the 26th of June I left for Algeria. I left in the morning by a special plane because the regular service was not available. I went to Paris and took a connecting flight which brought me to Algeria at about 10.30 a.m. The Foreign Ministers' Conference was scheduled for 4 o'clock the same evening. The Foreign Ministers were to meet at 3 o'clock in the People's Palace and from there they were to proceed to the conference hall. There were about 30 delegations present and only about 19 Foreign Ministers. Immediately I held discussions with the Foreign Ministers of friendly countries. At about 12.30 p.m. the Algerian Foreign Minister, Mr. Bouteflika held a meeting with certain delegations and he invited Pakistan as well. The other delegations invited to this meeting were the delegations of the People's Republic of China, Indonesia, the United Arab Republic, Syria, our own as I have already mentioned, Mali and one or two other Foreign Ministers of African states. The purpose of this meeting was to formulate a common approach for the Foreign Ministers' Conference so that we could take further steps to prepare for the next conference. It was suggested by a number of Foreign Ministers that all that we should do in the Foreign Ministers' Conference was to recommend Algeria as the venue for the postponed Conference. We all believed that Algeria had put in special and very great efforts for the preparation of the Conference and these efforts should not be in vain. Therefore, it would be in the fitness of things and only proper for us to hold the second Afro-Asian Conference, whenever it is held, in Algeria. As for the date, the Foreign Ministers were of the view that due to the uncertainties of the situation, the date of the Conference should be kept open. I must inform the House that a number of countries were very keen that irrespective of what had happened, the conference should be held as scheduled. This view was primarily shared by China and Indonesia. In our discussion with the Chinese Foreign Minister on the morning of 26th—I met him at 11.30 a.m.—he said that upto the previous night they were in favour of the conference but certain fresh developments had taken place which made them change their mind also. Unfortunately there had been a bomb explosion at the site of the conference which had caused some damage and injury to the personnel working on the conference site. After that explosion they felt that such developments could not be ignored. Thus on the morning of 26th the Chinese were also of the view that the conference should be postponed. So also Indonesia changed its mind and was of the view that as a result of these developments, as the crisis and the confusion have mounted, a conference of such a magnitude could not be held. So, according to them, all we had to determine was

the venue, which they suggested should be Algeria, and leave the date open.

We submitted to them that there were four courses open to us. First of all the Algerian Government could make a unilateral declaration stating that in view of the developments they would recommend that the Conference be postponed. This we felt was not the proper thing to do because the Afro-Asian Conference was not the responsibility of one country. The burden of it should not fall on the host country. So, we suggested that this alternative should not be considered. Then we said that a number of countries which have taken a prominent role for the promotion of the Afro-Asian Conference and which are regarded to be of importance in the world of Asia and Africa could make this recommendation. For instance, the very fact that we were having a special meeting of some delegations showed that some of us had taken a greater interest in the Conference and therefore a group of states should recommend that the Conference should be postponed. This also, we suggested, was not the right course to follow because there was an element of arbitrariness as to which country should be regarded as more active in the promotion of Afro-Asian Conference. This would unnecessarily lead to disagreement and friction. So that course should also be ruled out. Then we said that the Foreign Ministers could meet and—as a matter of fact, it was 2.30 by the time we came to this point—but the moment the Foreign Ministers met the Standing Committee would be dissolved because the Standing Committee had been brought into being for the promotion of the Conference, to prepare ground-work for the conference. It would come to an end the moment the Foreign Ministers met. As the two could not co-exist, and as it was absolutely necessary for the Standing Committee to continue its deliberations for the Second Afro-Asian Conference, it was essential not to hold the Foreign Ministers' conference. Even if the Foreign Ministers' conference were to be held some countries which had not participated could say: "This is not a representative conference of Foreign Ministers and its decision is not binding on us." Therefore, the Standing Committee should continue its deliberations. We had no complaint against it and it should recommend postponement. Earlier also it had recommended postponement. It had the authority and the right to recommend further postponement and also to fix the date. In our opinion it was equally essential to fix the date. There were some doubts being expressed whether the Conference would be held at all, and if dates were kept open, then that could give cause to people to say that the Conference might not be held at all. So, we suggested that a firm date should also be fixed. This suggestion of ours was also accepted. All other Foreign Ministers were formally consulted and the Standing Committee took the decision that the Conference should

be held at the end of October and that it should be held in Algeria.

Now, Sir, I come to the question of our stakes in the Afro-Asian conference and why we have taken such an interest in it. First of all there are historical reasons. We have all suffered under colonial domination. The people of Asia and Africa have waged a ceaseless and a relentless war against imperialism and we have to succeed in gaining our full independence. This struggle creates common problems and brings about an identity of approach and a common attitude to various problems. It is, therefore, necessary for countries which have gone through this process and whose peoples face similar problems—gigantic in many ways—problems of poverty, of under-development, problems of bringing about a better life for our people to marshal our resources, exchange ideas and have a point of contact and association for the promotion of our common objectives. That is one reason why we believe that it is necessary to hold a conference of Asian and African leaders.

There have been various views expressed on the Conference. Some have said that there is no such thing as Afro-Asian solidarity. Others have said it is a myth. Views have varied. Some regard it as a very important and necessary movement for the consolidation of our unity which is so essential for the realisation of our objectives. The very fact that there are divergent views on the importance of the Afro-Asian Conference manifests its importance. Many conferences are held all over the world. We hear of conferences in western and in eastern Europe, in America and Latin America. Everyday there are conferences on so many current issues. These are held and the world does not pay much attention to them, although they take important decisions. They are regarded normal and routine things. But the Afro-Asian Conference had been regarded as something extraordinary. A special meaning had been given to it, as if it were to pose a new challenge to the hegemony of the rest of the world; as if it was to become a mighty monster which was going to bring a millennium to an end. I think it would be wrong for anyone to read into a conference of this nature a great challenge to the hegemony of the rest of the world. The first Afro-Asian Conference of twenty-nine states undoubtedly played an important role in bringing about a sense of solidarity and in bringing about an Afro-Asian personality. It evolved the ten Bandung principles. These ten norms of international conduct have achieved friendship not only in Afro-Asian states but many other states of the world These are important principles known as Bandung principles and they have been applied successfully by Afro-Asian states and by the rest of the world.

If the first Afro-Asian Conference was only a step in the march of our realisation of the ultimate objectives of the people of Asia and Africa, the second Afro-Asian Conference was also another significant step in this long

march. It would not have changed the complexion of the rest of the world—it would have further consolidated the areas of understanding and co-operation among the Afro-Asian countries. It would have only identified the more serious problems that we face. It would not have armed each and every Afro-Asian state with nuclear weapons. It would not have put an end to our miseries, our frustrations and our problems. It may have contributed to ultimately bringing us closer together. But surely it would not have put an end to all our problems. It would not have given the final solution and final panacea for the people of Asia and Africa and their leadership. Yet there has been so much unnecessary opposition to a conference which could not have changed the privileged position of the rest of the world.

We have, nevertheless, made an important contribution in the realisation of our ultimate objectives. I would like to read out from a magazine which recently commented on the Afro-Asian Conference. I will quote from the *Newsweek*.

> In the decade and a half since the outbreak of the Korean war in 1950, the Western powers, consisting of the U.S. and her free-world partners in Europe, have provided the by-no-means paltry sum of $55 billion worth of economic aid to various nations of Africa, Asia and Latin America. More than half of this total has been forthcoming in the last five years alone.
>
> "Nevertheless, the slow-down is there to see. In the past two years, for instance, aid extended by the U.S. and other Western nations has levelled off at about $6 billion per year. America's share of this aid burden (not counting military assistance or various other programmes to counteract the communists) is now down to just over $1 billion, and nearly half of that goes to just one country—India.
>
> "However generous—or even profligate—all this aid may seem to Western tax-payers, it is still a trifling sum in relation to the West's gross national product and in relation to the magnitude of the task to be done. Right now the average annual income per person in the industrialised nations of the world is $ 1,900, while in the agrarian or under-industrialised countries it is only $ 130. Unless economic aid is vastly increased, the experts gloomily predict, the income gap between the "haves" and the "have nots" in another decade or so will be of the order of $ 4,000 per year as against a mere $ 800 per year."

The dismal statistics do not stop there. The developing countries—a good cross-section of whom would have been represented at the abortive Algiers Conference—are falling into debt faster than their ability to pay is increasing. In 1955, they were in debt to the tune of $ 10 billion, or 7 per cent of their G.N.P. Now their debt totals $ 30 billion or 15 per cent of their

G.N.P. and for many of these nations—especially those whose primary sources of national income are seriously threatened by tumbling commodity prices or the development of synthetics—there seems no way out of the hole. Ghana, for example, was once a relatively rich country. It began independence eight years ago with 476 million in the bank, and now it is adrift in a sea of red ink. But the root cause for Ghana's bankruptcy is the fact that the selling price of its main cash crop, cocoa, has dropped from 988 a ton in the early '50s to 364 a ton and is still falling. Little wonder, in view of all this, that the Afro-Asians, when they see both West and East pouring 120 billion into military hardware each year, when they see the U.S. resources are over-extended, find confirmation for their belief that the rich men's club is becoming increasingly callous toward the under-privileged.

We are the under-privileged. We are—if you like to call us—the poor men's club. Or at least we are the poor who find that our poverty brings us together. This poverty of ours poses a challenge for us and makes it necessary for us to combine our resources—limited, small and meagre as they are—to overcome insuperable difficulties we face in giving our people a better life. If that is the objective for which we make preparations for the states of Asia and Africa to meet, I see no objection whatsoever. Of course none in Asia and Africa—there ought to be none in Asia and Africa or for that matter in the rest of the world—who should have any objection for a meeting and conference of this nature.

We may be poor but our poverty does not make us lose our pride. Poverty and pride are no conterminous terms just as they are not synonymous terms. The question, you see, is that we are poor and we know why we are poor; we are proud and we also know why we are proud. We are proud because we are the heirs to the greatest civilization that mankind has known; we are proud because the most important movements of history have begun from the mainland of Asia and Africa; we are proud because we have a glorious heritage and a very rich past; and we have made valuable contributions to this word called "civilization". If today in this process of change and revolution and challenge we combine our resources and energies, nobody should have any objection.

In 1848 Karl Marx referred to the Proletariat in a given society. Mr. Marx is out-dated in many ways. In 1965 it is the proletariat nations, and these proletariat nations are the Afro-Asian nations. These proletariat nations of the world will have to unite and will have to co-operate with one another so that they can meet the gigantic challenges that their peoples face and their leadership have to bear.

There was another reason why the Afro-Asians should meet. At present the United Nations is facing a serious crisis. In the past it was possible for

the Afro-Asian representatives to meet in the United Nations. At present, because of the crises in the United Nations—and the United Nations having lost its importance—we have to have a forum to exchange ideas and to channelise our thoughts. That is why it is all the more necessary to meet. The present state of the United Nations being what it is—with a series of crises and reduction in its importance and when it is being bypassed in important international crises that face the world—it has become necessary for leaders who have common approach and identity of purpose to meet. That was another reason why at this particular juncture it was necessary for the Afro-Asian leaders to meet and to promote an Afro-Asian conference.

We have been told: "what is the necessity of the Afro-Asian leaders to talk about political matters when they face so many important economic and social problems? Political matters only create heat, and engender bitterness. It would be much better for the Afro-Asian leaders to confine themselves to economic matters."

We are very thankful and grateful for this advice and we have noted this advice. But at the same time, it is necessary for the leaders of Asia and Africa to consider political problems as well. It is absolutely essential for them to consider political problems before economic problems, although economic problems are of very great importance.

I have mentioned some of the difficulties that we are facing in the field of economic development. The prices of primary commodities keep on decreasing and the prices of capital goods keep on increasing. As in the case of Ghana, the figures which I have quoted, so also in the case of Pakistan, serious problems arise on account of fluctuations in prices of primary commodities. The prices of our jute and cotton keep on fluctuating. We lose immensely in our effort to build foreign exchange for development as a result of this situation. This is a great deterrent and handicap in the promotion of a viable and self-reliant economy. These are important problems, we do not deny it. We know, in many ways economic challenges are by far the most important challenges for the peoples of Asia and Africa—perhaps in the long run greatest of all challenges. But we must first settle the political problems. A country has first to win her independence; a people have to first become free. In an effort to become free, we do not think of development—we think even of destruction. When a nation fights imperialism, it has not to think of economic development. It is prepared to accept economic destruction to end a phase which will make economic development possible. Economic development under colonialism is no real development. It is a development for the exploitation of the people, and in return certain privileges are given so that the rule can last for a longer time. When people fought British imperialism, they were prepared

to see the destruction of their country. When the Algerians fought the French, they were prepared to see the annihilation of their economy. That is why in the fight against imperialism one has first of all to think not of economic development but of putting an end to exploitation and domination. This is the first thing to be done—putting an end to exploitation and domination. That is why it is essential, although economic problems are important, that we tackle problems of exploitation and domination which have continued over 200 years, and for still longer periods in certain parts of Asia and Africa.

When imperialism and foreign domination come to an end, then also one has to continue to be vigilant because new forms of restrictions and new forms of exploitation and domination are brought into being. Our Commerce Minister knows how much easier it would have been if there had been no trade restrictions and trade barriers. We are a growing economy, and yet tariffs barriers and quotas are fixed for a growing economy by the opulent parts of the world.

So, there are new forms and new challenges of a political nature which have to be met before the people can go forward towards economic development. In other words a nation must develop towards development. It must go through phases which are necessary to have a free and unfettered choice and participation in economy and social development of a country. That is why it is necessary for the countries of Asia and Africa to first of all lay primary and supreme stress on political matters and on all forms of economic, social and political exploitation and domination and then proceed to develop towards development.

You may ask what steps has Pakistan taken to become self-reliant and to develop towards development. I will mention them briefly, with the permission of the Minister for Finance. One of the most unusual things in the history of the developing countries and particularly for a developing country like Pakistan is that here in our country we have revenue surplus to the order of 140 crore, in spite of many expenditures on defence. This is only the revenue budget contribution to development. The provinces have made similar contributions. Foreign assistance component in the Second Five-Year Plan was about 54 per cent, whereas the actual foreign investment was about 45 per cent, less than what was anticipated. In the Third Five-Year Plan, we estimate that out of 100 rupees spent on development, 66 rupees will be our own and if the performance of the Second Five-Year Plan is any index, it should be even more. Food production in East Pakistan has gone up appreciably. In West Pakistan also there has been a great increase in our food output. In the field of agricultural commodities, we are now exporting much more, as the Commerce Minister said in Lahore the other day. I am very bad at statistics, but sometimes good in figures. I have

forgotten it now. But the food production has gone up enormously and we are exporting our own foodgrains at present. The Indus Basin work is more than half way through. This dependence is also gradually coming to an end. We are building two new steel mills in the country. We have diversified our dependence on petroleum, oil and lubricants. We are building our own refineries and at the same time we are making arrangements for the distribution of these products through Pakistani companies and Pakistani nationals. We are constructing a number of sugar mills and other important factories like fertilizer factories. In other words, we are progressing appreciably and abundantly towards economic self-sufficiency, and that is why we have to assist and work with other countries also in the same direction. This cannot be a singular endeavour. It is a collective endeavour. What happens in one under-developed country has its ramifications in other under-developed countries.

If the West with all its advantages and with all its power finds it necessary to work in co-operation and co-ordination, it is all the more necessary for the eastern countries and the countries of Asia and Africa, which have much greater problems, to co-ordinate and co-operate with one another in the realisation of the very important objectives of their people. That is why it was important to discuss political problems and political matters at the Afro-Asian Conference. I have mentioned the collective interest and the collective identity of views about the Afro-Asian Conference.

But independent of those collective attitudes, Pakistan has its own interest in the promotion of the Second Afro-Asian Conference. One of them I have already mentioned. As a former colony, having been under colonial rule for over two hundred years, it was necessary for us to suppport the movements of emancipation of people under colonial domination. We are a part of the world of Asia and Africa. We belong to the world of Asia and Africa. We cannot dissociate ourselves from the movements and aspirations of the people of Asia and Africa, the people to whom we belong and from where we come. This is the role and the dictate of history. It is the role and dictate of geography and of the political challenge that Asia and Africa face. That is why it was necessary for us to promote this conference. But in addition to that, Pakistan is an aggrieved country and an aggrieved person must find each and every platform to tell the world of how it has been victimised and how and why it is an aggrieved country. We have been badly betrayed, not only after Independence but even before Independence.

Every effort was made to see that the partition of the country did not take place. As far as we were concerned, it was a struggle for survival and for an honourable life, free from caste-ridden social system of the majority community. That is what the Pakistan movement meant to the Muslims of the sub-continent. But to others it did not mean the same thing. Others had

different objectives to promote. They wanted to see one indivisible powerful entity protecting and safeguarding their interests in this region. So, the partition of the sub-continent came as a defeat of the objectives they had to promote. That is why immediately after the partition, India was made stronger at the cost of Pakistan. At the last moment the major provinces of the Punjab and Bengal were divided. Muslim majority areas were given to India for access to Jammu and Kashmir. Territorial link was denied to us with Nepal, and I do not want to comment on the future of Assam and Tripura which is well known to all of us and to our brethren from East Pakistan. India was made stronger at the cost of Pakistan. We were aggrieved at birth and we have been aggrieved ever since we have come to life. It is necessary for the world to know the insurmountable difficulties Pakistan had to face and the people of Pakistan have had to face. We have had to face mighty challenges one after another. It is the spirit and the will of the people of this country which have made it possible for us to surmount each and every crisis.

People of Jammu and Kashmir are groaning under the heel of the most vicious form of imperialism known to mankind. Everywhere else imperialism is on the run. In the Afro-Asian Conference we had hoped to get sympathy and support to sound the final death knell for imperialism in Mozambique, Angola, Jammu and Kashmir and South West Africa. It was important particularly for Pakistan to be present at the Afro-Asian Conference to expose the fraud and deceptions perpetrated against Pakistan and to muster support of countries which have also gone through domination. They would sympathise with Pakistan in the realisation of our just objective. That is why we were promoting the Afro-Asian Conference.

Besides, the majority of the Afro-Asian countries are Muslim countries. If you were to count the countries that would have participated in this conference, the majority of them would have been Muslims and this in a way would have not only been a point of contact between all Afro-Asian leaders but for Pakistan it would have been an additional point of contact with the leaders of the Muslim world. This in itself world have promoted a better understanding among not only the people of Afro-Asian countries but also the Muslims of Asia and Africa. What role would we have played in this conference? I would not like to say that Pakistan would have played a valuable role. That is not the way this nation conducts its affairs. This is not the way we conduct our foreign politics. We believe that we would have had a valuable and important contact point with the leaders of all Afro-Asian countries. We believe that particularly with the Muslim countries and other countries with whom we have developed very close relations, we would have been able to exercise what we regard to be a proper and sensible approach to our problems. There is no element of animosity or

sensationalism in our approach. At the same time we are not unmindful of the difficulties and the realities that the world faces. We would have in certain respects advised caution. We would have in certain respects avoided bitterness, because bitterness does not pay, although we have reason to be bitter. We would have formed an important and valuable bridge of understanding between some parts of Asia and Africa and some parts of the rest of the world. I think this would have been an invaluable role for any country to play: history and the finger of fortune have placed Pakistan in such a position at present as to be able to play a constructive and positive role not only in sympathising with and appreciating the true aspirations of the people of Asia and Africa but also in explaining some of the problems and difficulties other people face and how these problems and difficulties could be tackled. We are two-thirds of the world. But that does not mean that two-thirds of the world should be pitted against one-third of the world. Ours should be a unity towards a greater unity. Afro-Asian unity should be a unity for a universal unity. If two-thirds of the world can unite, they can march forward towards the unification of the whole world on the basis of understanding and equality. That is our role, to promote unity and not anger and division.

Now, after this explanation, if there are still any doubts, or if there are still any "Bara Sahibs" or "Brown Sahibs" who think that we have no place in the world of Asia and Africa, to them I can only say this: "The people of Pakistan have no place for you in Pakistan, because Pakistan is a part of Asia and Africa, and Pakistan must march with the aspirations of the people of Asia and Africa, and combine its resources, its ability and its talent for the protection of our common objective".

It has been said that this Conference would have been dominated by China, and China would have used and exploited it for the achievement of its ends. Every country has a right to promote its own interests. As I told you, we have our individual interests to promote, and we would have promoted our individual interests. Not only China, but each and every country of Asia and Africa—whether it be Senegal, Mali, Syria, or any other country—would promote its own interest. China would also have promoted its interests. But to contend from this that Afro-Asian Conference would have been a conference of China and that the rest of the world of Asia and Africa would have been the cat's paw of China and that they would have been exploited by China, is a charge which I refute with all the vehemence at my command. China should know that, as a former colony and a country that has suffered under imperialism, no country in Asia and Africa is going to see the resuscitation of domination and imperialism. We will not permit the domination of any power, whether it be China or any other great power. If China were to dictate its terms to the conference, we would tell China

that we cannot co-operate and that this is not the proper approach to the Conference. If China were to tell Pakistan that, in return for our co-operation they will give us economic assistance or military assistance, we will say: "we do not want your economic and military assistance. We have won our Independence after a great struggle, and we will continue to safeguard our Independence. If we have fought the might of British imperialism, if the other countries of Asia and Africa have fought the might of French imperialism, and if these great powers and mighty monsters have left our land, then we are not going to replace one form of domination by another form of domination". China knows this, and every other great power should know this. Pakistan will not be dictated to. Pakistan believes in friendship, fraternity, equality of states and a common understanding amongst countries. But we will not barter away our sovereignty to China or to any other country for that matter. We will not become subservient to any great power. We believe in having friendly and co-operative relations with all the countries of the world, including the People's Republic of China. But if China nourishes any notion of domination because she has become a great power, that would not work. She cannot and would not dictate either to Pakistan or other countries attending the Afro-Asian Conference. If she thinks that because of her population and because of her might she can crack down on the rest of the Afro-Asian countries, then China would be disillusioned, as any other country in the world would be disillusioned. Those days are gone and those days will never return to the countries of Asia and Africa. That much must be known. History goes forward; history does not go backward. We cannot go backward. We cannot tarry with a backward movement; we cannot tarry with what has gone. That is a nightmare of the past. The nightmare has ended. No self-respecting and honourable people will accept the position of subordination and subjugation. We will undergo miseries and sacrifices, but we will not subject ourselves to political or economic dictation. This much China knows, and this much every other great power should know. This answer is true not only of Pakistan but of all emancipated people.

Before I conclude, Sir, I have an important announcement to make. It is a new development, of importance, and it is my duty to place this new development before the House and the nation. On the 3rd of July, the United States' Ambassador to Pakistan met the President of Pakistan, and delivered a message to him from President Johnson. The Ambassador stated that, as Congressional authorization had not yet taken place and appropriations had not yet been completed, the Consortium meeting, which was to be held on the 27th of July to pledge from the Consortium countries five hundred million dollars of aid for the first year of our Third Five-Year Plan, should be postponed from the 27th of July to the 23rd of September to enable the

Congress to make appropriations and for the Consortium countries, particularly the United States, to be able to pledge the aid and loans after the appropriations have been made. The United States Government also suggested that in this period of time, if the Government of Pakistan also wishes, the United States Government and the Government of Pakistan can discuss certain other problems also. This message, as I said, was delivered to the President on the 3rd of this month. This is a new and an important development. The House knows that at the pre-Consortium meeting, which met about a month ago, the experts endorsed our Plan, paid very rich tributes to Pakistan's performances and said that this pledge should be made. We were of the opinion, as in the past, that it was only a formality to be completed. It has been suggested that there should be a postponement to the 23rd of September, and also if the Government of Pakistan wishes, certain other problems can also be discussed between the two countries. I thought this is an information which the House should be interested in, and, therefore, I am placing it before the House. After I have the benefit of hearing the views of the members of the National Assembly, I shall again, with your permission, Sir, like to wind up the proceedings at the conclusion of the debate. I thank you.

Speech in the National Assembly on July 13, 1965 (Afternoon Session)

Consortium Meeting—Other Issues—Sino-Pakistan Relations—Malaysia—Afro-Asia—Pakistan's Foreign Policy—Afro-Asian Conference—Relations with India

Mr. Speaker, Sir, many subjects have been covered, and that is why I spoke this morning, and warned the House that it would not be possible for me to cover all these important subjects. The reason why I have not been able to cover some of the very important subjects which have been referred to by the Honourable Members of the Opposition is not because we are not prepared to discuss them, but because of the limitations of time. As a matter of fact, originally the foreign policy debate was fixed for a morning session, and it was on our initiative that we suggested that it should be a session covering the whole day, because we feared that it would not be possible to do justice to all the subjects. I would like to apologize not only to the members of the Opposition, but also to the members of the Treasury benches. If we have not been able to cover every subject of importance, it is not that we want to conceal from the House important matters. The very fact that we have informed the House of the latest developments that have taken place shows that we recognize not only the supreme importance of the National Assembly of Pakistan, but also the imperative need of taking the the National Assembly into confidence, and of informing them of all the major developments.

Sir, some of my friends from the Opposition have said that I have not given them enough information on the latest development. I can assure them that whatever information I have given them is all that I am able to give, and all that I have got to give them at the present time. There is nothing else which I am concealing from them. We had the opportunity of meeting some of our friends and colleagues from the Opposition benches yesterday, and I

took them into confidence that this was an important new development and that I would like to place it before them. There is nothing more that I have to reveal to the House and to them on the subject of the proposed postponement of the Consortium meeting. When the United States' Government have suggested to the Pakistan Government that we should discuss *other matters*—other *problems*, rather—if the Government of Pakistan so desires, you must be fair to the message that has been given. The United States Government have said that, if the Pakistan Government so desires, they would like to discuss other matters as well in this interim period. We have not been told what those other matters are. When we know what those other matters are, the House will be able to know exactly how and to what extent we are proceeding in this question. So I have placed before the House, that is before the nation, information on this development to the extent we know and to the extent this information has been communicated to us. I am not concealing anything. It is not our intention to conceal anything from the House or from the nation on such an important development.

Here, again, Sir, a number of important issues have been raised—question of the Rann of Kutch and its agreement, the Commonwealth Conference, some more comments made on the Afro-Asian Conference, certain speculations on the events that have led to its postponement, our attitude to the present development in regard to the proposed postponement of the Consortium meeting, how we should face the challenge posed by India's growing military might, what should be our relations with our neighbours, especially the more powerful countries that surround us, namely, the Soviet Union and the People's Republic of China, and what should be our relations with the USA and the Western countries. I would request, not only my colleagues and the members of the Treasury benches, but also members of the Opposition and the Leader of the Opposition, to realize the physical limitations of going into each and every aspect of the important problems that have been raised by them. I do not in any way diminish the importance of any of the issues that have been raised by them. I am, as a matter of fact, thankful to them. They have, in substance and in spirit, appreciated the Government's difficulties, and that is natural. They are part of this country; they are one of us. If there is a thin line that technically divides us as members of the Government and members of the Opposition, that does not mean that our feelings, our sentiments, and our aspirations are also divided. Today we are in power and in Government. Tomorrow it is likely that they will be in power and they will be in Government, because these are the ways of democracy. If they are in power and in Government, I think in a situation of this nature we would also extend our hand of co-operation and sympathy because it is not their interest or our

interest which is at stake. It is the interest of a hundred million people of Pakistan that is at stake. I do not absolve this Government of having committed mistakes. Of course, we have committed mistakes. *They* have committed mistakes when some of *them* were in power.

I have heard eulogistic references to the fact that the China policy of Pakistan pre-dated this Government and that it goes back to the visit of Mr. Suhrawardy to the People's Republic of China. Mr. Suhrawardy was an outstanding politician. I have great respect for him. He had great stamina and guts. But objectively speaking, and with the information that is available, I would like to say that it is not altogether fair to say that you can trace back the Sino-Pakistan relations to the visit. I am not detracting from the character and the greatness of that man. He is dead; he is not to be challenged. It is a part of Muslim tradition that we do not speak in disparaging terms. I am not trying to disparage him. I am trying to be objective. It is not fair and right to trace back Sino-Pakistan relations to that particular visit of 1956 of Mr. Suhrawardy to the People's Republic of China and, thereafter, the Chinese Prime Minister's visit to Pakistan.

The dynamics of international life are such that these things are obsolete. I would not go beyond what I have said. But I would like to say this much that here you may be right according to your judgement. According to the objective judgement there were certain complications which arose as a result of that visit, because soon after that visit Mr. Suhrawardy visited another great capital of another friendly country and he made statements and said certain things which caused innumerable difficulties in restoring a sense of confidence between the Pakistani nation and our immediate neighbour, the People's Republic of China. I do not want to talk in terms of inverted commas, quotes and unquotes, and what they have said about that visit, that is, what the People's Republic of China said and the events that unfolded themselves. There was a certain gentleman—Mr. Hamid Raza Gilani's uncle—who went to Peking at that ime. Thereafter he visited Washington. I do not want to rake up the past, but I would at the same time request the members of the Opposition to appreciate the fact that historically they are not correct in their assumption when they pinpoint that good relations between us and China date back to the visit of that great patriot of Pakistan. I regard him as a patriot because he was a man of courage and great vision. Yet, in this respect I would not agree with them. It would be an injustice to the man if I were to unravel what the Chinese leaders have said about his visit to the People's Republic of China and of his subsequent actions and conduct which complicated Pakistan-China relations.

Mr. Arif Iftikhar made an eloquent speech. He said that the question of

neutrality between Indonesia and Malaysia is not important. Malaysia is a British base, he said. He said to us that the Muslim population of Malaysia has been diluted by the formation of Malaysia, that the British have certain permanent interests of tin and rubber and certain economic considerations and that the whole policy of East-of-Suez which Mr. Wilson has propounded is a policy to strengthen Britain's hold over Malaysia. Although he did not say so, I am trying to read what he wanted to say. Mr. Speaker, there are certain things which can be said and done on Aikman Road, but they cannot be said and done on the Mall Road. So, if you say a certain thing on the floor of the House as a young, vibrant and dynamic member of this House, I am afraid, I cannot say with certainty the same thing, because it is one thing to do a thing on Aikman Road, it is another thing to do it on the Mall Road. But the fact of the matter remains that Indonesia is a country which is very close to Pakistan. Yesterday, I had the honour of meeting an Ambassador of a friendly country—and I emphasise the word friendly country—and he discussed with me Pakistan's recent developments. He said to me that there is some misgiving about Pakistan's relations with X, Y and Z countries and included Indonesia. I said: "Stop Mr. Ambassador. Indonesia is a Muslim country. Our relationship will always be directed towards the fulfilment of the ideology of Pakistan, which is the promotion of the best relations with another great Muslim power." As far as Indonesia is concerned, we will continue to make every strenuous effort to promote good relations which have been established between that great country and our country. The Presidents of the two countries have played a very important role. They have established between themselves a personal relation and important equation. That personal equation will, *Insha-Allah,* continue for the benefit of 200 million Muslims of this region. This is a very important development and we shall not compromise on it, come what may.

Shah Azizur Rahman—of whom I had heard so much but whom I met only recently—took me to task for being professor-like in the exposition of foreign policy. Sir, I am thankful for the compliment. But it was not meant to be a compliment and, therefore, I take note of the criticism as well.

World problems are far too difficult and far too complicated for Shah Azizur Rahman to use a big stick or a baton and to tell the people what they should do and what they should not do. If it comes to that it is much better to be theoretical, philosophical and moral than to show your strength and power because, in the scheme of things in which as Muslims we must believe, power and might are transitory factors. They go with the time. Mighty nations come, stand, fall, crumble and turn into ashes. What in the last analysis is important is the moral principle, the conviction, the direction and the destiny which the people may set for themselves. That

is why when I said pride and poverty are not synonymous, I was referring to the fact that we would have pride rather than development.

We are far too poor and it is not for me or for the Government to make a choice; it is for the down-trodden people, who know what is the meaning of misery, to make the choice whether they like to remain poor or whether they would like to have their pride. It is for a mother who sees a young son die because of lack of nourishment.

It is for an old father who knows that he has no recourse but the strength and the agility of a young son who is unemployed and who has no future. It is not for me or for you, Sir, to choose between pride and poverty. I did not say that we would much rather be proud than have our objective. I did not say that. I said in the context of the Afro-Asian Conference that because we are poor, it should not be considered and regarded that we have no pride. It was not in the context of our own situation; it was in an entirely different context. Shah Azizur Rahman will appreciate that he kept on talking in different contexts when he repeated the same subject. He would appreciate the fact that when I talked about the Afro-Asian Conference I said that it should not be regarded as something which is presumably small merely because we are poor. We have our pride, our sensitivity and our sense of honour. Sir, the Afro-Asian Conference has contribution to make not only for the consolidation of the Afro-Asian spirit. The Afro-Asian solidarity has to make a contribution not only for setting international norms, for creating unity for a greater international unity, but also because we have the capacity to think and the talent to put our thought into action. It is in that sense that the concept of the Afro-Asian world should not be under-rated merely because we are poor. We have our realisation. We have our past and we have our pride. I think Shah Azizur Rahman will agree with me and the records will bear out that this is the context in which I used pride and development and not in the context of our resources, because it is not for any of us to dictate what the poor people of Pakistan want.

The poor people of Pakistan, the 80 per cent people of this country, are the final arbiters. History will determine who served these final arbiters of power—whether it was your speeches or whether it was the weakness of the former regimes. I am not going into the question of the error of politicians. In the first National Assembly it was my responsibility as a Minister to go into all these subjects. Sir, the moving finger has written and the moving finger must write on, not only in terms of what was the situation before 1958 but what is the situation today and what will be the situation to-morrow. That applies not only to internal situations but to external situations also. I will come to that subsequently. I am not disparaging or being derogatory to former leaders. They were leaders of the Pakistani people.

But circumstances condition circumstances. You say that this foreign policy is not the product of the brain trust of this regime. Who said it is? Have we ever claimed that as magicians or some theatrical experts, we produce certain monkeys from our hats? Nobody has claimed this though it is stated by the Opposition that this Government thinks that it has evolved a new foreign policy. At no stage have we said that we are impervious to circumstances and the conditions under which we live. Which people can be?

You go back to Alexander. You go back to any other era of history. Circumstances and conditions have been the most eloquent compulsion of action. We cannot claim that we act in a vacuum, that we live and think in a vacuum. Undoubtedly, the circumstances and conditions have motivated and moulded our foreign policy and I do not think that any one in this Government would say, "regardless of these considerations have we evolved our foreign policy." It would be an unrealistic foreign policy if conditions and circumstances were not taken into account. Even the former leaders and regimes, irrespective of their weaknesses and mistakes, were Pakistanis. We are their heirs. When we talk about the history of Pakistan we do not say that those who preceded us were not our leaders. Obviously they were leaders. But history and circumstances also bring a break here. Here we have my colleague, Khawaja Shahabuddin who sat there as a Minister at that time when a certain matter was raised by Mr. Shaikh. This shows the continuity of leadership. Who says we deny the importance and the greatness of our former leaders. But, perhaps, due to circumstances and conditions there were certain difficulties. Time does not tarry. Time does not wait for individuals. New situations arrive, new conditions arise, and leadership must be born out of these conditions and circumstances. A time will come when we will become obsolete and then the fire-brand like young Arif Iftikhar and others will come and fill the vacuum, because in life there is no such thing as vacuum.

Now, Sir, it has been said that Pakistan's foreign policy is unrealistic. On the one hand we are members of Pacts, and on the other we try to improve our relations with the countries opposed to the Pacts. Here again, as in internal relations, a certain evolution has taken place. What was valid, proper and realistic yesterday need not be valid, proper and realistic today. There was a time when Pacts were important in a military sense. However with ballistic missiles, rocketry and with the ability to go right across the world without having bases or without having the peripheral alliances, they may be important today in a political sense, but, perhaps, their importance in the military sense, on account of this progress of modern science, has been reduced. As a result, today you find an association and amalgam between aligned countries, non-aligned countries and between the countries of Pacts. A new crystallisation of world events has taken place. A new

evolution, a new metamorphosis, a new process, a new phenomenon, has arisen in the world. During the past decade or so, it may have been different. Now let us think of the present. Today, it is possible for aligned countries, non-aligned countries and the countries which do not belong to any concept of alignment or non-alignment, to co-operate with one another for human progress and for human dignity. That is why today you see some sort of detente and some sort of understanding between the Soviet Union and the United States of America. Would that have been possible in the classical sense of alliances? Would that have been possible in the sense of NATO and Warsaw pitted against each other in an infernal confrontation? That would not have been possible but for the evolution of science, its progress and time lag which enabled that young dynamic and great President John F. Kennedy to go to Vienna to meet Mr. Khrushchev and start a new process and a new change to reach an understanding. So, if it is possible due to the changes and circumstances for the United States of America and the Soviet Union to strive for some sort of *modus vivendi,* should it not be also acceptable and reasonable for a small country like Pakistan—small relatively speaking—to try and strive for a *modus vivendi* with powerful neighbours living around it? It is but axiomatic. It is not something which comes out of a rope trick or out of hat. These are the forces of events which cannot be explained. There is no logic stronger than the force of events and, inevitably, therefore, the force of events has brought about a new situation.

Mr. Abul Quasem, who has a fresh set of teeth, is not here tonight. But he should know the differences between the past and the present. He sees things in terms of black and white. Things are no longer seen in terms of black and white. What dominates the world is some other factor. It is no longer in term of, "you are right and I am wrong". That is what has brought about a new situation and new phenomenon in international relations. There was a time when the US had to contain the Soviet Union. China was not the consideration in those days. The Berlin blockade and the Truman Doctrine—all that is a thing of the past. Today, you find the Soviet Union and the United States having some sort of equation and some sort of understanding for a world which deserves to be spared of nuclear annihilation. Now, the question and consideration here is the extinction of mankind or the survival of mankind.

And when it comes down to the question of extinction or survival of mankind, ideology recedes to the background. As stated by Mr. Hasan A. Shaikh, ideology is a subsidiary consideration; survival and existence is the main consideration. He quoted Mr. Altaf Hussain's editorial in *Dawn* with which we have been inspired so much. (Not only are we inspired by the articles and what is said in *Dawn* but more so by the very presence

of Mr. Altaf Hussain amongst us.) Circumstances and conditions have changed internationally. The crystallisation of forces is no longer in terms of alignment and non-alignment. It is in terms of the common objective for the progress and survival of humanity. That is why, Mr. Speaker, Sir, it was possible on the 28th of June for the President of Pakistan representing an aligned country to have a conference in Cairo with Mr. Chou En-lai, representative and Prime Minister of a Communist state, Mr. Gamal Abdel Nasser, President of a non-aligned country, and Dr. Ahmed Soekarno, President of another non-aligned country. Before the new crystallisation took place such meetings were confined to Tito, Nasser and Nehru. Why? Because the world was divided in alignment and non-alignment. Whenever Tito-Nasser-Nehru met the world listened and they wanted to know as to what was happening, what were going to be the declarations and what pace these leaders were to set for international relations and for international norms. Washington wanted to hear what was the communique. Equally anxious were Peking and Moscow to know what was happening. The reason being, as the President of Indonesia termed it: "there were the old established forces as against the new emergent forces."

The new emergent forces have now come into being and that is why non-aligned leaders can sit and talk with aligned leaders today. This is not accidental. It is because of the evolution of international relations that you find a leader of an aligned country, a leader of a communist state, and two leaders of non-aligned countries meeting in Cairo and symbolising the heart of the Afro-Asian solidarity. The Afro-Asian solidarity means that you can have your own social system and yet come to a degree of understanding for the good of mankind. When we are told that we cannot have good relations with certain countries if we have social systems different to theirs, I think this is said either in jest or without knowledge of the full implications of it. This is a form of dictation—the very dictation that we opposed to take from the United States in the debates that we have heard. We say that we will not be dictated. Now if we say that we can co-operate only when both of us have the same social system, it would amount to a form of dictation. It is a manifestation of chauvinism. If Pakistan were to be a great power, which it will be, *Insha-Allah,* though it is not a great power at present, and if it were to say that we would only have relations with other countries when they become Muslims and not otherwise, then she could not have relations with other countries. When we say that Pakistan must change its internal economy in order to have good relations with Indonesia and China, it means that Pakistan is being dictated by other countries as to what should be its social system. Why should we then object to the United States or to any other great power dictating to

us as to what should be our social system? There is an inherent basic fallacy in this statement and that is what the Bandung Conference meant when it said that social systems may differ—you may have your own social system and we may have our own—but there must be international co-operation for the preservation of international peace and for the preservation of mankind. This is one of the foremost and famous Bandung principles. When you demand that your internal social system should change to meet the requirements of the social systems of other countries, this is a negative step of co-operation between countries. The basis of co-operation between countries is that let them live as they want to live and let us live as we want to live. You remain on your side of the fence and we remain on our side. You do what you like on your side and we do what we like on our side, but as far as the humanity and the world is concerned let us co-operate. That is what Mao Tse-tung meant when he said, "Let a hundred flowers bloom; let a hundred schools of thought contend." You have your social system: we have our social system. Why did you make, Mr. Shah Azizur Rahman, condition precedent to having good relations? This idea that we should change our social system is a wrong approach. This is an imperialist approach. This is a chauvinistic approach, and if we were in a position to enforce that, then we would demand all countries to become first Muslim before we have any dealing with them? Is that possible? That is not possible. We have to deal with Buddhists, we have to deal with Christians, we have to deal with communists, with all other countries and with people having their own social systems, and bring about an area of agreement irrespective of the social system.

Now, Sir, something has been said about the Afro-Asian Conference. I went into great length on the Afro-Asian Conference to disabuse the minds of both the members of the Treasury benches and the Opposition of what they have heard. That is why I went to a great length to explain chronologically as to what happened. In spite of that, some of my friends from the Opposition, attributed fascinating fairy tales to us. There is no tale. Mr. Shah Azizur Rahman says: "We have read *Dawn,* we have read the *Pakistan Times* and we know what the tutored and controlled Press of Pakistan has to say." I did not want to refer to the foreign Press because that may give the impression that we are being arrogant and trying to take unnecessary credit for things. But since he has compelled me to refer to newspaper reports other than those from our country, I am afraid you will have to bear with me when I refer to some of the comments of the foreign Press. Mr. Shah Azizur Rahman, a very eminent and eloquent speaker from East Pakistan, who quotes Iqbal with such great fluency, would allow me to say something in French.

You want me to continue in French? No, I do not think. I will then translate what the daily *Figaro*, a French newspaper, dated 28th of June, says:

After the collapse of the Afro-Asian hopes in Algiers the attention is focussed again on Cairo. President Nasser, Chou En-lai and President Soekarno decided to hold a small summit on Tuesday. They asked their Foreign Ministers who attended the deliberations in Algiers to come and make a report. The Egyptians, the Chinese and the Indonesians will surely draw the conclusions of the deplorable fate of the second Bandung. Since President Ayub arrived this morning, the four met today. After the talks, President Ayub left for Karachi. Their concern and their feelings are far from being the same. For Mr. Chou En-lai, the postponement of the conference is a failure. President Nasser is more lucky since he made a spectacular *volte-face* at the last moment. The Egyptian diplomacy just managed to escape ridicule, but it did not play the foreground part. It is Pakistan which played it. Only on Saturday, in the Algerian capital, Mr. Bhutto was the one who really brought the compromise, first using threats [I do not use threats as you know, Members of the Opposition] that the Summit Conference would be *held in a capital other than Algiers.* Personally he succeeded in convincing Mr. Bouteflika to subscribe to a non-debated motion of adjournment. He underlined the consequences of convening a conference of Foreign Ministers to decide the fate of the Conference.

Then I go to *Le Monde* which is another famous paper of France, as you know, Mr. Speaker.

On Saturday morning, a few hours before the meeting of the Foreign Ministers, no solution had been found yet. So everybody was pleased with Mr. Bhutto's proposal. The Pakistan's Minister of Foreign Affairs suggested to have the meeting of the Preparatory Committee which takes the decision concerning practical matters. [So the politicians would be replaced by the administrators. This is what Mr. Anwar Shaikh would like—the politicians to be replaced by the administrators.] The Ministers would be concerned only with the postponement. He demonstrated to the Algerians and the Chinese and the Indonesians after the speech which took place on Friday in the building where the Conference was to be held that it would be Utopian to expect the participation of the Heads of the State. He finally succeeded when Mr. Chou En-lai, Mr. Nasser and Dr. Soekarno said from Cairo that they did not want to attend the Conference personally. Whatever the decision taken in Algiers, it was announced that the meeting would not be held. When the meeting of the Preparatory Committee with Ambassadors of 15 states took place later on, everything was finally settled satisfactorily.

So, Sir, that is *Le Monde.* Finally, Sir, I would like to take some more

time to read a report in the *Statesman* of India which said that Pakistan saved the day and that Pakistan, China and Indonesia, with Pakistan leading, were responsible for having the Afro-Asian Conference. It said something which I would regard to be a compliment, a form of tribute, to what the correspondent called, "Pakistan's clever Foreign Minister". That is what Mr. Mashihur Rahman said—that we should not be clever in our foreign diplomacy. I did not refer to them [these extracts] in the morning because this is some sort of empty praise for the Government, but since you people made such fantastic charges against the Government—"speaking in one voice in Karachi and speaking with another voice in London, and with a third voice in Algiers"—I was compelled and constrained to make references to the reports which have nothing to do with our internal politics, and also to the Indian newspapers which too are not happy or satisfied. But the fact of the matter remains that as far as Pakistan's role is concerned it was motivated by objective considerations. Here we have been told that a special representative came from the Algerian Government. But all was not well in Algeria. There was bomb explosion, students were rioting, demonstrations were taking place and they were shouting slogans. The day before the Conference about 70 people were seriously injured at the place where the Conference possibly was to take place. The Chinese Foreign Minister told me that he was prepared to go to the Conference but his delegation did not want to risk the life of their Foreign Minister. And how was it that the Algerian representative came to tell us all is well in Algeria? What he said is not important. What were the objective considerations and objective conditions? That is what is important and nothing else. The objective consideration and the objective conditions necessitated and forced the postponement on us. Why should we be happy with the postponement of the Conference when we lay so much by the Conference? I told you this morning that Pakistan has its own independent and individual objective and interest to promote. We will go to the second Afro-Asian Conference and *Insha-Allah* the second Afro-Asian Conference will be and shall be held with the combined effort of the Afro-Asian world.

I agree with Mr. Anwar Shaikh entirely that with a mighty and great force we must collaborate. We will consolidate our unity and we will promote our unity for a greater unity of the world. Pakistan will do everything in its power. Pakistan had not played a hypocritical role in the first Conference. We have not now been influenced by the Britishers or Mr. Wilson. Mr. Wilson cannot teach us. The British taught us for 100 years but we taught them in the end and they left with their bag and baggage. They cannot teach us, they cannot seduce us, they cannot cajole us. We are a nation of 100 million people. They are a nation of 40 or 50 million.

The British cannot cajole and intimidate us. We saw what was in Pakistan's interest. We were not influenced and our actions were determined solely by the consideration of Pakistan. It is true—and here I agree with Mr. Anwar Shaikh—that certain Members were taken into confidence. I do not know where he gets his information. Sir, he must be very well-informed that the Members were taken into confidence. I told my President and he agreed that it was good taking certain Members into confidence. I will not be going into merits and demerits of the Mission. I told Mr. Arif Iftikhar that in the position I am placed, I may not go into the facts and reasons for analysing the pros and cons of the Peace Mission. The members of the Opposition should realise that the very fact that Pakistan refused to be a member and later chairman of the Mission shows that we are on the same line we had basically been. There must be certain reason why the President of Pakistan refused membership and chairmanship of the Mission and I would not like to say more. The members of the Opposition can understand why we refused membership.

Now, Sir, I have been taken to task by some of my friends for not having made any reference to the Rann of Kutch and to our relations with India. Relations with India to us are very important and in some respect they are most important to us. Relations between Pakistan and India are of such utmost importance, as Mr. Masihur Rahman said, that war between India and Pakistan if it ever took place would be a war of special character. It would not only be a war between two countries, it would be a war which would inevitably affect the minorities in both the countries. It will affect 50 million Muslims of India and about 10 million Hindus in Pakistan. So this can be the war of the grave, the most devastating and the most barbaric war that man can face. So far we have been able to hold our own despite overwhelming odds and difficulties. We have been able to hold our own, not because we are capable or efficient but because of the sacrifices made by the people of Pakistan to maintain a strong and viable Pakistan to face the Indian threat. At the heart of the whole problem of our relations with United States of America lies the question of our relation with India as well, and I will come to that later. But, Sir, in the meantime in the ups and downs and the vicissitudes of crises we have had with India from 1947 onwards, the high water-mark was reached during the Rann of Kutch dispute. This is the way sometimes history moves. It becomes uncontrollable; events get out of hand; events have their own dynamics. A time came when the whole Indian army was poised against the frontiers of Pakistan and the Pakistan army had to take counter-measures.

Those 10 mountain divisions which our Western allies had provided to India for the defence of India against Laddakh were poised against the plains of the Punjab. These very same 10 mountain divisions which we

were told were meant for India's defence against the Chinese in Laddakh were poised against and were facing Pakistan. As a result a deadly and dangerous confrontation existed between India and Pakistan. Our position is that the Rann of Kutch upto the 24th parallel is disputed territory which covers about 3,500 square miles. According to us that is Pakistani territory and we have sufficient evidence and proof to establish that these 3,500 square miles form part of the territory of Pakistan. India, on the other hand, claims that the Rann of Kutch is a part of Gujrat State and it is Indian territory. That is why the dispute arose. Well, before this Government came into power, in 1956 Chadbet was captured and occupied by the Indians. Chadbet was at that time in the possession of the Pakistan Government and of Pakistani forces. We were telling that they were in our possession in 1956, and if we had been there in the Opposition I am sure there would have been a harrangue and great noise.

These are political decisions and the Commander-in-Chief has nothing to do with it. The politicians take the decision. Today if we find that certain things have happened, it is we who have to take the responsibility and not the Commander-in-Chief of the Pakistan army. The Commander-in-Chief of the Pakistan army has to implement whetever is decided upon by the Government. What is the position today? If we ask the Commander-in-Chief to go up to Dharamsala, he would have to go to Dharmsala. If we ask him to stop at Dharamsala, he would havc to stop at Dharamsala. But that is not a relevant question, Mr. Shaikh. The whole fact of the matter is that India occupied part of the territory held by us in 1956. Sir, unlike my good friend Khan Bahadur Wassan who comes from Tharparkar, I do not think about it in terms of part of my own constituency being at stake. It is undoubtedly part of the Pakistani territory, part of Sind territory and I am familiar with this problem. As a young boy I remember having gone to Chadbet and having gone to Karimshahi which were at that time part of Pakistani territory. I sympathise with the feelings of Khan Bahadur Wassan in this respect. I think what he has said on this question is very important: we have to build roads; we have to fortify these regions: they are important to the defence of Pakistan. We will take up that question and I would like to assure the Member from Tharparkar that we will take up this question subsequently. But here the question was much bigger than that and we saw India gradually creeping into the disputed territory. So we had to take measures in our self-defence. It was incumbent on us not because we wanted to go to war with India.

As I have said, war with India is a most deplorable thing for any one to visualize and contemplate, but certainly we could not allow India to settle the dispute by force. Our point of view has been that we should settle all our disputes by the peaceful means of negotiations, mediation, arbitration,

by recourse to Article 33 of the United Nations Charter and by any other peaceful means that is available to states. So, here we found India trying to settle a problem by military means and we were compelled to take action in defence of our own territory. We took that action. It has been said that after having taken that action, why we stopped and why we allowed the military advantage to be frittered away. We did not allow the military advantage to be frittered away. If we take that argument to its logical conclusion there should be a total war between India and Pakistan and nothing short of total war. You do not stop at Dharamsala, you have then to go on to Srinagar which is the heart of the problem between India and Pakistan.

Pakistan, without Jammu and Kashmir is a body without a head. So it means total war and if we subscribe to the principle of total war then it is not in Dharamsala or Karimshahi, Kanjarkot, Chadbet or Biarbet that we have to fight; we have to fight where the problem lies, that is, in Jammu and Kashmir. But then it means complete devastation and destruction. India knows that sooner or later she will have to abandon Jammu and Kashmir and I tell you, Sir, why sooner or later, because no country can retain a colony. The whole history of mankind has been a liquidation of empires. The British had to liquidate their empire. The French had to liquidate their empire. The Belgians had to liquidate theirs. The Germans had to do the same. Why should the Indians be an exception? It is bound to happen with India. India must vacate Jammu and Kashmir because it is colonial domination. Till then we have to keep our pressure. Today the cease-fire line is not an invitation to dinner. The cease-fire line is a very aggravated line, and what is happening on the cease-fire line today is nothing short of war between India and Pakistan. You know, Sir, the recent developments in Jammu and Kashmir itself would show that the people of Jammu and Kashmir are in revolt more than they have been ever before. The Sadiq Government was not even able to contemplate a peaceful night in a Muslim state for the celebration of the Eid. Can you imagine Muslim people not being able to celebrate their Eid in their own country. We had lights, we had illuminations, we had rejoicings. There, in Jammu and Kashmir, it was a mourning for Mr. Sadiq and his cronies because for five million Muslims of Jammu and Kashmir this was not a day for rejoicing. It was a day of challenge and they felt something might happen. Something is happening there all the time. The problem is very much alive. It has got to be very much alive, it has got to be alive in our time. It is alive today. The reality of the situation is that the problem of Jammu and Kashmir is alive as it has never been before. We are quite mindful of our responsibility to the people of Jammu and Kashmir. Pakistan, as I said, can never be complete without the people of Jammu and Kashmir forming part of

Pakistan.

I have repeatedly said we are not in a state of sophistication and refinement. We do not say any more that the United Nations must hold a plebiscite to determine whether the people of Jammu and Kashmir should accede to India or Pakistan. The people of Jammu and Kashmir belong to Pakistan and let the Indians say that they do not belong to Pakistan. We lodged a complaint with the United Nations, and there we made a mistake—not we, but our previous Governments. We thought that the United Nations was the last word for all problems Like a poor man in a village who thinks that the Magistrate and the Deputy Commissioner are the last word, we went and lodged our FIR with the United Nations and we found that, as in the case of District Magistrate, our FIR was of no use. We learnt that with the passage of time, and now we know that the FIR is of no use. We must rely more and more on our own efforts. This is where we come in conflict with our allies and friends. They have complicated the solution of the Jammu and Kashmir problem when they talk about Chinese menace and think that India must retain the valley in order to face the aggressor from China. India cannot face any problem in that region if the whole people are hostile to India. It is only when the people are behind you that one can face a solution—as has been said by Mr. Mahmud Ali and Members opposite, we agree that the people must be behind. How can India face a situation in Laddakh when the whole of the population is hostile to it?

That population must feel that it is a part of the national struggle and then only can it struggle. The whole thing is artificial. The whole thing is superficial. India must abandon sooner or later its possession of Jammu and Kashmir, just as Portugal must abandon Angola and Mozambique and South Africa must abandon its possession in South West Africa. Today, India is to Asia what South Africa is to Africa and Israel is to the Middle East. A day will come when the world will realise that India as a whole is indefensible and that there is not even an iota of morality which leads these four hundred million people. Their future is a future of bankruptcy because they have defrauded the whole world and they have cheated the international community. India wants the best of the world with its long arms. It goes to Moscow and extracts military assistance from the Soviet Union by saying: "if you do not give military assistance we will go into the American camp." Similarly they go to Washington and they talk of huge tanks and say: "If you do not give it to us, we will go into the Soviet camp." These are the rope tricks of India. These are the reasons why we had to depart from India for our own life and for our own society because these are intolerable ways. These are not the ways of an honourable people and of a dignified nation. That is why we had to part our way with

that country. But as far as the Rann of Kutch is concerned (I go back to the Rann of Kutch) the principle of arbitration has been accepted. But I do not want to say anything more, because India plays with everything. India plays with words, India plays with honour and India plays with truths. So, if I say that arbitration has been accepted, Mr. Shastri will have to make some other statement tomorrow in the Lok Sabha to denounce and to decry the arbitration. The agreement is self-evident and all the rope tricks in the world are not going to make India get away from this agreement. If they want to get away from this agreement, that is a different question. Well, a people can close their eyes and say that something does not exist when it exists.

Sir, Jammu and Kashmir is not the only problem that we have with India: we have certain other important problems.

The eviction of the Muslims from Assam and Tripura is the most shameful tale of woe. I was talking to the Ambassador of a friendly country yesterday and I was giving him some details as to what was happening there. Today helpless people are being driven out of their hearths and homes and thrown into Pakistan not because they are Pakistani citizens and not because they are saboteurs. We do not have money and resources to have saboteurs. We do not have an organisation which is invisible. We do not have those resources. We cannot send saboteurs to India. They come from India. They are the Indian citizens, who have fought for India and who have laboured and struggled and toiled in India night and day—helpless children, men and women are being driven out of their homes only because they happen to be Muslims. So far, in the matter of a few years, we had over four lakhs of them. This is as important a problem for the people of Pakistan as is the problem of Jammu and Kashmir because they are Muslims. We owe a special responsibility to the Muslims of India and this is one of the most atrocious crimes perpetrated against humanity.

In addition to that, we have the Indian proposals to build Farrakha Barrage. East Pakistan Provincial Assembly has passed a resolution and rightly so against the concept of the Farrakha Barrage. Originally the Farrakha Barrage was to flush the silt of the Hoogly. That is what we were told. Farrakha Barrage was meant for the preservation of the Port of Calcutta to flush silt that was accumulating in the Hoogly. We were told that forty thousand cusecs of water would be required. But subsequently India modified its scheme and now has a project of three hundred crore not only to flush the Hoogly but also to irrigate the portions of North Bengal on its side as well as through the river Dogri and Teesta to irrigate the portions on eastern part of the area held by India. This is a complete change and a change at the cost of the people of East Pakistan, which means at the cost of the people of Pakistan.

These are some of the important developments that have taken place between India and Pakistan, and yet some of our friends say: "Why is it not possible for India and Pakistan to live at peace with each other?" One of the reasons why we asked for Pakistan was that we could not live together in the same community with the Hindus. Let us go into our own corner and choose our own path and live in peace with the people of India. But that peace must be an honourable peace. That peace must be a proper peace. That peace must not be dictated to us by India. That peace must not be by keeping the people of Jammu and Kashmir under the heels of Indian domination. That peace must not be at the cost of the people of Assam and Tripura driven out of their homes day and night and a great caravan and a great traffic of tragedy being pushed into Pakistan. That peace must not be at the cost of Pakistan's natural resources. That peace must not be at the cost of Pakistan's prestige. That peace must not be at the cost of Pakistan surrendering its legitimate interest as a sovereign, independent state.

Now with all this Mr. Shastri has renewed the proposal for no-war pact declaration. This is an important matter. Time and again we have referred to the reasons why we cannot agree to a no-war pact declaration. I have mentioned the important disputes between India and Pakistan—Jammu and Kashmir, evictions, Farrakha Barrage etc. In spite of these Mr. Shastri says he is prepared to renew the non-war pact with Pakistan. Now we are prepared to have a no-war pact with any country of the world. But first of all disputes must be settled before you enter into a no-war agreement. The Indians say at the same time that they are not prepared to negotiate. Mr. Nanda the other day in Srinagar said that the debate and discussion has ended. They are not perhaps prepared to negotiate, yet they want no-war pact. They are not prepared for mediation, yet they want a no-war pact. They are not prepared for arbitration, yet they want a no-war pact. They are not prepared for United Nations adjudication, yet they want a no-war pact. The Indians preclude every peaceful settlement. We are willing to consider a no-war pact. But they preclude a peaceful settlement and they preclude a settlement by the force of arms. So they want to have their cake and eat it too. I say to the Indians that if they are so interested in the no-war pact why don't they offer a no-war pact to China? It is much more logical for India to offer a no-war pact to China. Why? Because China has not precluded a peaceful settlement of the Sino-India dispute. China has said that they are prepared to settle the boundary dispute with India either through the aegis of Colombo Powers or through any other means of peaceful settlement of disputes. Now if India were to tell us that they are willing to have an honourable and equitable settlement of the Jammu and Kashmir dispute we would have to consider such thing. But India does not offer a no-war

pact to China. All the time China is willing to have peaceful settlement of their boundary conflict with India. Instead India says they want arms—very long arms from Washington as well as from Moscow and they want to settle this matter "honourably" and by throwing out China.

So, as far as China is concerned, a no-war declaration is not offered because according to the Indians, China occupies a part of the Indian territory. I am not going into the merits of the situation. This is the Indian statement, that China occupies a part of the Indian territory. Therefore, they cannot enter into a no-war declaration with China. They must throw non-alignment principles, go through sacrifices, and not offer no-war pact. We say India holds a greater part of our territory. India should never again make this offer to Pakistan, because that is fradulent and deceptive offer; it is an offer which the Pakistani nation can never accept in the circumstances.

One of my friends—and another one not so friendly—has said that my speech did not go to the relevant aspects of Pakistan's foreign policy and that it was a discourse like that of a professor. I have already made my comments on that. It is not that I have dealt with the foreign policy of Pakistan as if I was teaching in a class-room. I do not pretend to have that much knowledge. But we are going through a state of flux and confusion. In a time when confusion and flux is on high tide of our age—it has happened sometimes—if we go on trying and thinking correctly and logically, it helps. I believe my idea of trying to tell my friends and comrades in the Afro-Asian Conference about the solidarity of the Afro-Asian spirit and unity was not a vain exercise. I think these are important and germane questions, which have not only to be asked but have to be answered.

And it was in that spirit that I referred to the Afro-Asian Conference. And I hope that they will forgive me that it was not pragmatic enough, because sometimes you can be so much pragmatic that it leads to difficulties. But if you would bear with me for a short while I would like to say that Pakistan's foreign policy and whatever modifications and changes that have been made in it—whether they have been the result of events, compulsions forced on us by circumstances, or whether they have been by evolution. I am not going into that subject—they have been made without animosity, without any rancour and without any prejudice.

There has been an honourable evolution in our foreign policy. It is not that we could not have taken to the gallery. It is not that we could not indulge in sensationalism or create bitterness, prejudice and anger. But we felt that in the long run and in the ultimate analysis it is better to modulate and change a foreign policy on a much more sensible and a much more rational basis. Therefore, these changes have taken place without any rancour or without any bitterness against any Power, although we feel that we

have got a case to get to the gallery and spit fire. But we have avoided doing that because in the long term that is not right.

So, first of all whatever changes have been made in Pakistan's foreign policy, they are profound and have been modestly made without dramatization. Secondly, Sir, I would like to say that we have normalised and rationalised our relations with all the great Powers. Before that, our relations with some of the great powers were sub-normal and we have normalised them. With some of the other great powers they were abnormal and we have normalised them. So, there has been a process of normalisation in both ways. The abnormal and subnormal relations have been normalised. There has been a process of normalisation with all great powers. This is an important aspect of Pakistan's foreign policy. In addition we have vastly and enormously improved our relations with France, West Germany and certain other countries of Western Europe as well as Eastern Europe and this has again been done in a spirit without sensation or publicity.

We have also, Sir, tried to articulate our relations with the Muslim countries, and our relations with Muslim countries are more important than our relations with any other country. There has been a process of articulation in that. Finally, Sir, we have taken bold initiatives to come to a process of understanding and accommodation with all our neighbouring countries—here I would like to say, including India. I may be a little subjective, but some may say that we have not made an attempt. I can assure you that even in so far as India is concerned we have tried to reduce our differences. If we have failed, it is not due to lack of effort on our part.

Sir, this process of moving towards better understanding with our neighbouring countries is of the utmost importance, because geography is a permanent factor. It is the most important of all factors. Geopolitics play a decisive role in deciding a country's foreign policy. Modern science can make all the progress in the world but it will never make sufficient progress for a country to carve itself out from its locale and neighbourhood and place itself in another environment. We are there for all times. It is not like an individual who if he does not like a neighbourhood can change that neighbourhood, like Mr. Faruque who can move from Clifton to Nazimabad, say. You cannot, as far as a country is concerned, do that. A country remains put and it cannot change its neighbourhood notwithstanding all the progress of science. This is a constant factor. Ideologies can change; political systems can change; social systems can change; points of view can change. And, because, geography can never change it is the most difficult and important thing to get on well with the man who lives next-door. And if you cannot get on well with the man who lives next-door, it is likely you cannot get on well with the man living farther. The most difficult thing is to get on well with the country that lives next to yours. Why? Because the stresses and

strains of daily life make it difficult for countries to live together; and also the legacies left behind in the wake of history. That is why boundary disputes are the most delicate and most sensitive disputes—because they are between neighbours. That is why in our century we have witnessed two World Wars—because the neighbours could not get on well with each other. That is why we have seen Europe ripped apart—because the neighbours were unable to establish an equation. Germany invaded France and France invaded Germany. There was the Austro-Hungarian Empire, the Hundred-Year War, the Seven Years War and the War of Roses. All these were due to the fact that neighbours could not establish an equation between themselves.

Europe was torn asunder because the neighbours could not get on well. Conversely, the United States of America catapulted into a great power because it was able to stabilise its relations with its neighbours. It had no problem with Canada in the North, and with the help of the Monroe Doctrine it could stabilise its relations with South America. Because countries in Europe had difficulty in resolving their disputes with their neighbours Europe was torn asunder; because the United States had no difficulty with its neighbours, it catapulted into a great power within a short period of 100 years or less. As far as the states and nations of Asia are concerned, the challenge to us is much greater because during 200 years of imperialism the imperialists have made out their private preserves. They do not allow the Asian states to settle boundary disputes and the legacies left behind by history. When the British had to face the Russian's penetration into the sub-continent they did not fight it in the sub-continent. They fought it at the battle of Crimea. When the imperial powers were expelled from Asia, the challenge to Asian leadership to establish a *modus vivendi* and understanding between the neighbouring states became all the more greater, much greater than before. The old legacies, the old problems and the old difficulties could arise again. At the time of Asoka there were great empires in our parts because he was able to stabilise his relations with his neighbours. That is why Akbar, again, for similar reasons, was able to take his Empire to great heights, whereas Aurangzeb, who was more outstanding than Akbar in many ways, found it not possible to live with his neighbours. Therefore there was trouble. Pandit Jawaherlal Nehru was the most intolerant neighbour known to history. He was arrogant and he brought about difficulties with neighbours—with Pakistan, and—I do not want to mention other countries but—with all other countries. He was like a Hitler of Europe, and that is why we suffer today—because Pandit Nehru was not able to establish equations with his neighbouring countries. So, for Pakistan it is all the more important to restrain itself to bring about a sense of equation and understanding with all its neighbours. In this respect, the People's Republic of

China, the Soviet Union, Afghanistan and other countries are important neighbours of Pakistan. But while we may be able to appreciate the need for good neighbourly relations it is not necessary that our neighbours also will be able to appreciate the same spirit. Therefore, we have to try and find a second line of defence. Now, Sir, it is a quest for finding friends outside our neighbourhood, because it is one thing for Pakistan to try and accommodate its relationship with its neighbours and it is another thing for the neighbour to reciprocate those gestures. We have seen that India has not reciprocated any of those gestures. So, as a result of it there was natural understanding between the United States of America and Pakistan which lasted for over a decade. In this association it was not that Pakistan's interests alone were similar to those of the U.S. Pakistan undertook certain obligations which were also in the interest of the United States policy and its global interest. There was a mutuality of understanding and of benefit. But since 1959, the situation has changed a little. I say 1959 because it was at that time that there were skirmishes on the mountain-tops of Laddakh between the Indians and the Chinese. That was an important turning point: the United States of America felt that perhaps here was an opportunity where India would be able to align itself with the United State's global policy. The fact that this is not possible and this is not conceivable is a different question, but according to the wisdom and the judgement of the United States they found in those skirmishes the possibility of India which to that date according to them had been hostile and promoted communist interest—because non-alignment of Pandit Nehru was regarded to be giving respectability to communism—becoming aligned. The fact is that there was possibility of a situation changing. I say 1959 because it was then that the first skirmishes took place between the Indians and the Chinese. It was at that time that we heard from the United States Administration that India can be a show-piece for the democratic world and that all efforts and all resources would be spent to make India an important show-piece of democracy. It was in 1959 that Mr. Kissenger, one of the intellectuals of the Democratic Party, visited New Delhi and said that there was a time when the United States was suffering from Pactitis. That remark was made in 1959. The fact that the United States of America, the author of the concept of Pacts, should send one of its important intellectuals to New Delhi who said that there was a time when they suffered from Pactitis, was significant. It was in that period when the full Consortium requirements of India were met whereas Pakistan's requirements were slashed, which necessitated among other things a meeting between President Kennedy and our President. It was at that time that important envoys were sent to India to look into what could be done to facilitate India's economic and social improvement. It was in 1959, much before the Sino-Pakistan relationship developed.

This is a very important consideration because very often we are told that on account of Sino-Pakistan relationship, which goes contrary to certain requirements of the free world, consequences must follow. But here I say that the timing of it is very important. It was at the time when the Indians and the Chinese shed each other's blood in Laddakh that these changes began to take place, much before the Pakistan boundary agreement with China, much before the P.I.A. agreement, much before President Ayub's visit to China and much before the development of Sino-Pakistan relationship. So, we cannot forget the important and vital overtures made to India in 1959. This is a very important consideration in the formulation of Pakistan's foreign policy. Besides, some of the members of the House—and that includes the members of the Opposition—have said that this Consortium has made political motivations, and that the Pakistani nation must not surrender to these pressures. I would not like to be unfair to the United States Administration.

I would not like to jump to the gun. I would not like to anticipate things, which may reasonably the anticipated, because it is not fair to the other Government. When we are told by a great power that there are certain constitutional requirements which have to be fulfilled, we have to take it at its face value, though there are precedents in the past for these constitutional requirements not to have been fulfilled. It is not necessary for us to read more into it, although more can be read into it. But why should we do that? Here I would say that it is not necessary for us to anticipate things. It is necessary for us only to prepare for events but not to anticipate things. It is necessary for us to mobilise our nation but not to think that the nation will be called upon to fulfil the end of mobilisation. So, I would request the House to please take this new development in a proper and balanced way.

Now I will give the reasons. Sir, I will try to finish it as quickly as possible. I hope you don't mind. First of all, time and again we are told that there is no connection between economic aid and political objectives. Whether there is or is not, time and again we are told that there is no connection. That is why we are told that we must tone up our machinery, we must improve our efficiency, we must have the proper apparatus to be able to absorb foreign capital, to be able to absorb foreign loans because they are given for economic considerations. The World Bank is a commercial bank. It will give a loan when it knows that the loan will be repaid with interest. Therefore these being economic considerations, we have to consider the fact whether we are economically capable of meeting these requirements of repaying the loan with interest or not. According to the pre-Consortium meeting we are in a position to repay these loans. Our economic development and our economic progress is sufficient to be applauded by

the experts. Also we realize the relationship between developed and developing nations. Just as in a society, if the disparity between the haves and have-nots grows, tensions arise, so also in the world. It was in that context that I said that the Afro-Asian world is a world of the proletariat. Unnecessary tensions arise in the world if the disparity between the developed and the developing countries grows. I am sure that the developed countries realize the consequences of these tensions ; and just as in their society we find a Henry Ford who tells the barons of capital that he is going to make a departure, he is going to give the workers a fair deal, he is going to give them houses, he is going to give them facilities, so that they participate more in the growth of industry, so that they are not regarded to be different from the rest of the society, so that they can have an interest in society, so also for developed and developing economies it is necessary for the disparity to be reduced. So, firstly, there is the fact that there is supposed to be no connection between economic loans and political objectives. Secondly, it is in the interest of the developed societies not to create dispartities and tensions between the developed and developing societies.

Now, Sir, these are two important economic considerations. But in addition to that, I think, it is unfair to the United States to charge it with political motivations at this time. The United States' plate is full. It has problems in South Vietnam ; it has problems in South-East Asia ; it has problems and deep differences with France; in its own backyard its tranquillity with the Dominican Republic has been disturbed; it has irritated West Germany over the Middle East ; it has had some difficulties and differences with the United Kingdom, in spite of the veneer of understanding; there are student riots in Korea; there are student riots in Japan ; Indonesia has gone; the UAR has gone. Why should the United States at this juncture want to create difficulty with an ally of a hundred million people? Let us not be uncharitable to the United States; let us give them the wisdom to realise that it would be a folly, it would mean that the United States' interest in Asia will be permanently terminated, if Pakistan is isolated. Why should you want to be so unfair to the United States? You should grant the wisdom to the State Department and to those who mould the foreign policy of the United States Government to realize that at this juncture, when the United States is absolutely saturated with international problems, it should not break with an aggrieved ally.

Mr. Speaker, Sir, this morning I said that we wanted the Afro-Asian Conference because we are an aggrieved party. As far as the United States is concerned we are an aggrieved party because since the Sino-Indian dispute took place the United States rushed arms to India, and said that it was an emergency assistance, although the President of Pakistan had been told that whenever arms are given to India, Pakistan would be consulted. Before

that America was selling arms to India at what is called rock bottom prices, which Mr. Mohammad Ali Bogra, the then Foreign Minister, had mentioned in his first foreign policy debate. Then after that there was the Nassau agreement for 60 million dollars of assistance. At that time we said, India—our mortal enemy, a country which has not reconciled itself to the creation of Pakistan—is being fortified. They said, this is a temporary arrangement. Then at Birch Grove,—they gave another sixty million dollars. And we said, there is another 60 million dollars. They said it is also temporary. Then after that they gave long-term military assistance to India, and we said that this is a long-term military assistance, they said, all right, we have decided in the interest of our global policy to give long-term military assistance. And that assistance grew and grew with the time, and now the United States of America is committed to a massive and gigantic programme of fulfilling the arsenal and insatiable requirements of India which can only be directed against Pakistan, and not against the People's Republic of China. We are, Sir, the aggrieved party. It is not that the United States is an aggrieved party. What is the aggravation that we have caused to the United States? For ten years we have been their faithful friends. I know, Sir, some of our friends may take objection. They may say, "you have been too faithful, you have been too friendly; now you repent". But we do not repent. We are the aggrieved party and for two years we told the United States of America that the consequences of this are going to be disastrous for us. We talked about the massive military aid. But after that we haven't said much. But the fact that we haven't talked about it does not mean that we have reconciled ourselves to this position. We have not reconciled. We can never reconcile ourselves to this position. Even when the sun melts we will not be able to reconcile because this is a position to which no Government of Pakistan can reconcile itself. And because we have been silent, does it mean that this is a silence of the grave, and it must lead us to the grave? Does it mean that the morality of the problem has shifted? We are the aggrieved party, and we are willing to hold a discourse and a dialogue with the United States of America, and to tell them how we are an aggrieved party, and how in spite of these aggravations, in spite of these grievous injuries, we have not abandoned our friendship with them. This, Sir, is a very tall order. This is the tallest order for any people to make. There was the Aswan Dam, there was UAR and Nasser, Soekarno—they all said, "thus far and no further." But Pakistan, for one reason or the other, call it what you will, has stood by them in spite of these aggravations. Today we are told that there are certain political irritations. Who has caused political irritations to whom? Have we caused? We have been caused grievous political injury. We saw during the

Rann of Kutch crisis the difficulty of the situation. The United States was caught spinning. We quoted to the United States the Dulles' assurances. The Indians told them the Eisenhower assurances. We said that Indians were using American aid: the Indians said that we were using American aid: and the whole American diplomacy was caught spinning. In 1965 this is the position. In 1970 India can turn round to the United States and say, "well you have tried your best with Pakistan. You have not been able to succeed. Now close your eyes. The Partition of India was an injustice to the Bharat Mata. Let us settle the problem in our own way." And if that happens, what will be our position? The United States Government should realize our difficulties as an ally and friend. We are not the tortuous, blackmailing, diabolical people like Indians to take aid from U.S., take aid from Soviet Union, and once they have got aid they will say: "We are 400 million, you leave our land." These are important considerations, United States Government must be mindful of them.

The foreign policy of a country is not formulated by an individual, it is not formulated by a region, it is not formulated by a Government. Individuals may come and go and we have no objection if individuals have to go as a result of this challenge. This is not material. The future of Pakistan is much more important to us than the future of an individual. We have seen office, we know what office means—more important than office is Pakistan's self-respect. If we have to go as a result of that situation we will be very happy to go; we will not shed any tears because in that we would have served Pakistan, according to Bandung spirit. Ever onward and never retreat. The Afro-Asian spirit will build the world anew, and we will build it anew.

Speech in the National Assembly on November 17, 1965

Indian Aggression—Heroic Defence of the Armed Forces—Indian Record of Aggression and Ambitions—India's Animosity towards Pakistan and Pakistan's Attitude towards India—India's Intransigence and Determination to Retain Kashmir—Freedom Movement in Kashmir—

Mr. Speaker, Sir, I would like to associate myself with the sentiments expressed this morning by the Leader of the House and by the Leader of the Opposition. The resolution, which was unanimously passed in praise of our Armed Forces, whose courage and fortitude in this heroic struggle, which we had to face against the Indian aggression, is unparalleled in contemporary times. Sir, a treacherous armed assault was made upon our country by a wanton, predatory and habitual aggressor. Aggression, Sir is an international crime, a crime against which humanity for centuries has tried to find the machinery to resist, to prevent and to oppose. All the efforts of the world to have a League of Nations, a United Nations and any other association of peoples and nations is primarily meant to prevent wars of aggression. So far mankind has not fully succeeded in preventing aggressions in the world, but, nonetheless, substantial progress has been made over the years to prevent armed assault and aggression by powerful states in order to quench the insatiable appetite of aggrandisement and chauvinism against weaker and smaller states. These efforts, as I said, have been partially successful. We have seen in our life-time that twice in this generation international wars have been waged, and efforts have been made by the international community to prevent recurrence of war which is an international crime, a crime which brings disaster and destruction to humanity and to mankind, which prevents the development of societies, which arrests the natural growth of peoples.

In our own sub-continent we have unfortunately witnessed one holocause after another, and in spite of the strenuous efforts made by the international community in this sub-continent, India has not been prevented

from waging one war of aggression after another, in the eighteen years of its history as an Indian sovereign state. The 6th of September, 1965, will rank equal, I think, Sir, in terms of importance, to the day on which the British, in the guise of the East India Company, landed at Surat in 1913. It will also rank with the 13th of April, 1919, when the massacre took place at Jallianwala Bagh.

A monstrous aggressor pitted all his might and all his force against the people of Pakistan on the 6th of September, 1965, in utter violation of all the rules of international law and international morality. Although this treacherous and barbarous attack was unleashed on the people of Pakistan without any declaration of War and although we are a smaller country, we were able to resist this wanton aggression for the simple reason, Sir, that ours was a just cause. We upheld a righteous cause and ours was a just struggle. Therefore, because we held a righteous and just cause and because we had faith in the Almighty Allah, our people fought valiantly, bravely and courageously. They not only held the aggressor but repulsed this wanton and treacherous attack on the sacred soil of Pakistan.

This, Sir, is the history of the world. All those people who are determined to espouse a righteous cause, who do not surrender or compromise on fundamental principles, can never fail, no matter how heavy the odds or how great and strenuous the struggle. It cannot be forgotten that when the people of France waged a revolutionary struggle against oppression and tyranny, they waged it successfully although all the kings and monarchs of Europe were pitted against the people of France, who were putting up a heroic and righteous struggle. Those poor people, the down-trodden, the oppressed, had to succeed because they were defending a just cause and upholding a righteous struggle. So also, Sir, the brave people of Ireland, who took up arms against the might of the British Empire, succeded in the end because theirs was a righteous and just cause.

This morning a speaker made a reference to the heroic and gallant struggle that the small forces of Islam had to put up against the Byzantine Empire and the Persian Empire. Here again, because the cause of Islam was just and reighteous, they had to triumph. And so also at the time of crusades; or when Ghazi Kemal Ataturk fought against all the might of the Greeks, the French and the British to save his country and homeland from imperialism. Same is true of the defenceless Christians who fought against the Roman regions ; or of the people of Europe on the 1st of September, 1939, when they had to face the hordes of Hitler's Nazis and the overwhelming superiority of the German Army. The people of Czechoslovakia, Poland and the rest of Europe resisted and resisted very bravely. There may have been some temporary upsets and upheavals, but in the long march of history it is not a temporary period or a momentary crisis

which is important. It is the ultimate outcome of righteous struggle which counts. We saw in that period that there were people who believed that it was impossible to face a mighty invader like Nazi Germany. They, the Petans and the Lavals, believed that the only way was to surrender. But then there were the De Gaulles and the Churchills who, in spite of Dunkirks, in spite of the fact that the flicker of freedom was all but lost in Europe, had the power, the capacity and the conviction to resist. They were ultimately triumphant because they believed that in the end principles are stronger than the military prowess of a state. They believed that a people's struggle made for an honourable and noble cause must triumph, no matter what the odds.

Here also, Sir, the people of Pakistan had to face a similar situation. India, as all know, is three to four times our size. It has built a mighty military armada capable of unleashing wars of aggression against all its neighbours. It is a country with exemplary record of aggression to its credit. It was capable, in objective terms, of fulfilling its objectives but it could not fulfil its objectives. It can never fulfil its objectives because the people of Pakistan will defend a righteous cause and the people of Pakistan will make every sacrifice to defeat the realization of the dreams of an aggressor and the ambitions of an army of tyranny. Indian efforts will not therefore succeed against a cause which is right and which is just.

I say that the policy of the Government of India is a continuous process of aggression. I say that aggression is an article of faith embodied and enshrined in the hearts of India's foreign policy makers. It is the central theme of India's external and internal philosophy. In these eighteen years India has repeatedly committed aggression. I would like the House to remember that on October 22, 1947, India committed aggression against the states of Junagadh, Manavadar and Mangrol, which had acceded to Pakistan under the 1947 Indian Independence Act. But India refused to recognize the fact of accession, and Indian troops invaded the states of Junagadh, Manavadar and Mangrol, and after having committed aggression, usurped the states. Sardar Vallabbhai Patel went to Junagadh and, as many of you may remember, there he, standing under the temples of Somnath, declared that they had conquered these states because they, being Hindu states, belonged to India.

Then again on the 12th of Setptember, 1948, the Indian troops invaded the state of Hyderabad. They called it police action. When they had overrun Hyderabad, again in the same spirit of chauvinism, the Indian leaders, Sardar Vallabbhai Patel and others, boasted that another glorious chapter had been added to the history of India and to the post-independence period.

In 1947 the Indian army invaded the State of Jammu and Kashmir, and

subjugated the people of that state. Again on the 17th and 18th of September, 1961—apparently the Indians must be doing this due to some astrological consideration as most events of committing aggression occurred in the month of September—India invaded Goa. Before invading Goa, the Prime Minister of India visited the United States and there, in U.S., Pandit Nehru said that peace was a passion with India, that India was dedicated to peace and it abhorred the use of force and violence. A few days after that his armies marched into Goa and occupied that little place. Mr. Nehru, after the conquest of Goa, told reporters:

> "This operation, small as it was, deserves attention from the point of view of the efficiency of our defence services and the close co-ordination with each other. It is true that the operation is much simplified by the lack of opposition, nevertheless it was a highly efficient one and shows the quality of our defence services."

So, he was putting into operation and testing the efficiency and the co-ordinating skill of his Indian army in overrunning Goa. This is only to show how deep-rooted and calculated the policy of the Government of India is to settle its disputes through the use of force.

In 1962, at the time when Sino-Indian conflict erupted, Mr. Nehru is reported to have said on the 13th of October: "Our instructions are to free out the territory." When asked how soon it would happen, he said that he could not fix the date. That was entirely for the Indian army to determine. But it was clear from his statement in Madras that it was he who set the pace for the Indian army in this regard also. There he said: "I have ordered the Indian army to throw the Chinese out". This action of him resulted in the Sino-Indian conflict.

All this shows, Sir, that during these eighteen years India has committed aggression after aggression; on 22 October, 1947, against Junagadh, Mangrol and Manavadar; in August and September against the State of Jammu and Kashmir; on 12 September, 1948, against the state of Hyderabad; on 17 and 18 September, 1961, against Goa; in October, 1962, against China; and finally against Pakistan on the 6th of September, 1965. These are the specific, categorical and undeniable instances of India's aggression in these eighteen years. This is India's record as a peaceful and peace-loving country since its independence, the record of a country with whom peace was a passion.

But this is not a new phenomenon in Indian philosophy. It is baptised by the ancient verse of India's sage and saviour who is regarded to be the Machiavelli of the East, and whose war book is the bible for Indian thinkers and Indian politicians. He writes many centuries ago, for the guidance of Indians as follows:

> "A neighbouring ruler should ever be considered as an enemy. A

neighbouring ruler should ever be considered as an enemy, but friendship and alliance must be cultivated with neighbour's neighbour. The monarch should be ever intent on conquest. The king should avoid actual warfare and use other means of weakening his enemy by sowing seeds of dissension in his camp, by employing spies and hired assassins, by use of poison and women."

A king in other words might have recourse to all means, fair and foul, for encompassing and achieving his end. This is the bible of India's warfare, which has throughout centuries stood the test of time so far as Indian rulers are concerned. That we, Pakistan, as a neighbour, should ever be considered as an enemy, and friendship and alliance must be cultivated with the neighbour's neighbour. A monarch should be ever intent on conquest. A king should avoid actual warfare and use other means of weakening his enemy by sowing seeds of dissension in his camp by employing spies and hired assassins, by use of poison and women. A king might have recourse to all means, fair and foul, for encompassing and achieving his ends. This, Sir, is our neighbour. These are the ambitions of our neighbour, and this is what the people of Pakistan have to reckon with in living with this neighbour.

Now, in so far as Pakistan is concerned, we unfortunately occupy a special position. We occupy a special position because is spite of the combined opposition and reluctance of the Indian leaders Pakistan was carved out as an independent state. The people of India or, I should rather say, the leadership of India have not yet reconciled themselves to the existence of Pakistan. India's whole conduct, India's whole philosophy and India's whole outlook is against Pakistan. Pakistan is regarded as completely irreconcilable to India, to India's destiny and to India's greatness. Now, this is a reality or, my friends would say, this is a fact of life that the Indian leadership refuses to reconcile itself to the existence of Pakistan. That is why Pakistan has been regarded by the Indian leaders as India's enemy number one. I would not like to tire the House or you, Sir, by going into all these statements that have been made in this respect. These are well known; but nonetheless I would take your time and mention some of the statements and some of the observations that have been made by Indian leaders on the creation of Pakistan and on the existence of Pakistan.

Mr. Pannikar, in 1945, had this to say in his book, "Future of India and South-East Asia":

"Unless these distant bases like Singapore, Aden and Cortia are firmly held and the naval acumen is developed in order to afford sufficient protection to these parts, there will be no security or safety for India."

Giving a formation of Indian plan and dimension over South-East Asia,

Pannikar said:

"The political future of these areas is indivisibly bound up with India. Therefore, a common defensive system with a co-ordinating political machinery at the top seems unavoidable. What seems to be required in the light of experience of the present war is the re-constitution of the old Indian empire on a different basis."

Then there is Dr. Sumkarnand or whatever he is, Governor of Rajasthan. He said in an article, "India's neglected political frontier", on the 26th of January, 1965:

"While the geographical frontier between India and Pakistan is laid down on the map our political frontiers lie in Pakistan Afghanistan frontiers and further West into Afghanistan itself".

Then Mr. Khanna, Minister for Works, Housing and Rehabilitation, declared on the 14th March, 1965 in Ambala:

"Pakistan was India's enemy number one and its challenge was to be met".

Then is Mr. Chavan, the Defence Minister of India, who has made a number of bellicose statements. He declared in March, 1964:

"We shall see that India becomes the graveyard of Pakistan."

Then Thakur Prasad, a Hindu leader of Jan Sangh Party, said in November, 1964:

"We shall not rest content till Pakistan is destroyed and merged with Bharat."

And then again Ram Manohar Lohia, India's Socialist Leader, said:

"Attack East Pakistan. That is the only way."

Other statements have also been made by the Indian leaders repeatedly. All these statements have now acquired a new vehemence and a new string since the abortive Indian attempt to conquer Pakistan on the 6th of September. This is India's attitude towards Pakistan, one of irreconcilability, one of aggression, one of animosity, and one of hatred.

Now, it has been said that Pakistan also has a prejudice against India, has a hate complex towards India. Let us examine these observations that it is not India alone that has an offensive and an aggressive policy towards Pakistan, Pakistan also has a similar policy towards India. First of all, Sir, this is an observation which goes against the very struggle for Pakistan. The struggle for Pakistan itself was based on the consideration that if the two communities could not live under the same roof for over a thousand years irrespective of the efforts and experiments made to bring about some sort of *modus vivendi* with a national policy, then the best thing was for the two peoples to separate and at least live in peace and tranquillity under the same sky. One of the motivating factors for the creation of Pakistan was to be able to live in peace and harmony with

the majority community. As it was not possible to achieve this within a national fold, it was considered necessary that perhaps by going apart we could come together. So, the very basis of Pakistan establishes the fact that on our part we sought Pakistan for among other reasons to be able to live in peace and harmony with India.

Secondly, as compared to India, we are a small country, much smaller than India in every way, in terms of manpower, in terms of resources, in terms of industry, in terms of geography, and in every sense and in every way. Look at it from any angle, from any definition. We are a smaller country. It would therefore be sheer madness on our part to embark on an aggressive policy against a country which is larger and greater country in respect of resources, in respect of industrial capacity and in respect of its military capacity.

Thirdly, Sir, the post-independence history itself shows that time and again we have sought to establish a relationship of normality with India. First of all, you will recall that soon after Partition, Liaquat Ali Khan went to New Delhi and tried to seek ways and means of bringing about peace and friendship between India and Pakistan, a peace of honour, of course, a just peace. Thereafter, Governor-General Ghulam Mohammad took a number of initiatives to establish some *modus vivendi* with the leadership of India. After that you will recall that when the late Mr. Mohammad Ali of Bogra became Prime Minister of Pakistan, he made a pilgrimage to Delhi—as he called it—and referred to Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru as his elder brother and said that we have to live in the same sub-continent. We cannot ignore the facts of geography. So, Mr. Bogra with his enthusiasm and zeal and conviction marched to Delhi as a messenger of peace and goodwill to establish friendship and understanding with the leadership of India. After that when President Field Marshal Mohammad Ayub Khan came into office, you will recall that a number of profound and far-reaching initiatives were taken by him and his Government to establish friendship and amity with India. There were a number of successive and different boundary agreements with India. We concluded the Canal Waters Treaty which was second only to the Kashmir dispute in terms of its complexity. Certain proposals were also made for co-operation in the field of trade, commerce and economics by the Government of Pakistan. But what was India's reaction? India's reaction was wholly negative. They were prepared to have goodwill, without a just and equitable settlement of the Jammu and Kashmir dispute.

Today the Indian leaders say that it is difficult to have any negotiations or contacts with the present leadership of Pakistan. Were they prepared to do so in the past? Have they forgotten the many initiatives, constructive and positive, that this very leadership of Pakistan took in order to bring

about an understanding between the people of India and the people of Pakistan. What has been India's response to these overtures? The only response of India has been to tighten its hold and strangulation over the people of Jammu and Kashmir.

I would now like to take the time of the House to enumerate chronologically the various measures India has taken in respect of Jammu and Kashmir in brazen violation of the firm and clear commitments it made in the United Nations in 1948 on the plebiscite, and in violation of the various declarations, both bilateral and unilateral, that the Indian leaders including the Prime Minister have made time and again on the right of self-determination of the people of Jammu and Kashmir. In brazen violation of these international commitments and despite the various measures taken by the Government of Pakistan to establish good neighbourly relations with India, India has done the following things to strangulate and oppress further the people of the State of Jammu and Kashmir.

In 1949 there was a reservation of seats in the Constituent Assembly of India for the occupied State of Jammu and Kashmir; in 1950, the Indian Government convened the Constituent Assembly, the so-called Constituent Assembly of the occupied State of Jammu and Kashmir ; in 1954, the first legal step was taken under the Constitutional Order of 1954 amending a large number of Articles in the Indian Constitution so that they could be applied to the State of Jammu and Kashmir; in 1956, the Constitution framed for the so-called State of Jammu and Kashmir Assembly was promulgated; on November 10, 1956, the Government of Pakistan drew the attention of the Government of India and of the Security Council to this departure from its solemn commitment. Then again, administration of certain departments were transferred from the State of Jammu and Kashmir to the Government of India, and these were National Highways, Telephones, Telegraphs, Income-tax, Broadcasting, Customs, Accounts and Audits. Then in 1956, financial matters were brought at par with the other States of the Indian Union and in collaboration with the State entered into zonal arrangement. Then again, the creation of State cadre for the I.A.S. and I.P.S. was promulgated in January 1957. In 1962 on August 28, Bakhshi Ghulam Mohammad, the then Prime Minister of occupied Kashmir, remarked that let Article 370 of the Indian Constitution be scrapped so that the State of Jammu and Kashmir should become an integral part of the Indian Union. On 6th September, 1962, in reply to a query in the Indian Lok Sabha, Mr. Lal Bahadur Shastri, among other things, stated: 'it was the ultimate desire of everyone in the country that integration should be completed in 1963'. Bakhshi Ghulam Mohammad, on October 3, stated: Sadar-i-Riyasat title should be changed to that of a Governor and that the Premier of the State should

be called the Chief Minister. On the 27th of November, 1963, Mr. Nanda, the Indian Home Minister, suggested the following steps which were confirmed by the late Prime Minister of India to be taken by the Government of India for the integration of the State with the Indian Union. The Order of the President under Article 370 of the Constitution was issued on the 25th of September, 1963, applying to Jammu and Kashmir State entry 26th of the Concurrent List in the VIIth Schedule in respect of legal and medical profession and other consequential provisions of the Constitution. A proposal to apply to Jammu and Kashmir entry 24th of the Concurrent List in so far as it relates to the welfare of the labour in the coal-mining industry was made. Then it was decided that the representatives of Jammu and Kashmir in the Lok Sabha should be chosen by the direct election as in other States. Then in 1964, a Bill was passed in the Lok Sabha seeking the re-designation of the Head of the State and of the Head of the Government, and then abrogation of Article 370 was moved in the Indian Lok Sabha by an independent member. Then again extension of Articles 356 and 357 of the Indian Constitution were applied to Jammu and Kashmir. Thereafter in December last the extension of Article 81 of the Constitution was also applied to the State of Jammu and Kashmir. Then, Sir, after that, the National Conference was merged with the Indian Congress.

So, Sir, all avenues of peaceful settlement were progressively closed by the Indian Government. It was evident that by its efforts to close each and every avenue the Indian Government would precipitate intensification of the internal struggle. But it went on step by step, measure by measure, to integrate the State of Jammu and Kashmir into the Indian Union. And while it kept on integrating the State into the Indian Union, it poured in its Armed Forces and there was an increase in the Indian Army in the occupied State. Efforts were also made to Indianise the Civil Services. Shaikh Abdullah and Mirza Afzal Beg, who were released from imprisonment for a short period of time, were again imprisoned. In December, 1963, we had the Hazratbal shrine incident which brought about wide-spread chaos and frustration and agitation in the State of Jammu and Kashmir.

Now, Sir, I would like to point out to you that when Shaikh Abdullah was released from jail and he went abroad for a short period of time, he said on the 27th July, 1964, that the people of Jammu and Kashmir were prepared to make the greatest sacrifice for the right of self-determination and, if necessary, would support the struggle on the lines of the Algerian people. This is a most important statement which was made by Shaikh Abdullah in the background of all the steps that India had taken to integrate the State of Jammu and Kashmir in the Indian Union and to Indianise the State. On his release he stated that he would have to organize a

movement in the State, if necessary, on the lines of the Algerian people. I would like the House to mark these words carefully. The Indian Government has chosen to characterize the struggle which has developed, when Shaikh Abdullah was again placed under detention, as a result of Pakistani infiltrators. It appears to the Indian Government that everyone of the five million Kashmiri people is a Pakistani infiltrator. If this is how they look at the Mujahedeen who are sacrificing their life every day, we in Pakistan are proud to have them called Pakistani infiltrators. They are indeed, Sir, our kith and kin. They are same blood, Sir, animated by the same emotions, subject to the same feelings, as the one hundred million people of Pakistan. They are a part of us and neither they nor we shall rest till they rejoin us to share both our joys and our sufferings. This I must tell the world. This is the point that unites Kashmiris with Pakistanis. This is the link which nothing can break. It is a phenomenon of togetherness which fuses their past and present and our past and present into a common future, which shall emerge as a glorious chapter, perhaps the most glorious chapter, in the history of Islam.

Now, Sir, I briefly recapitulate what I have said so far. First of all is the record of India's aggression, India's animosity to Pakistan, Pakistan's attitude to India and Pakistan's intentions both in terms of historical fact and recorded-history, and at the same time India's intransigence, India's determination to hold on to the state of Jammu and Kashmir, to which she has no right whatsoever either under law of politics or history or geography. India is holding on to the State of Jammu and Kashmir, not because it is a piece of territory. India is herself large enough. The territory of the Indian Union is very large. So it is not a question of territorial aggrandizement that India wants to hold on to the State of Jammu and Kashmir. It is not because India wants to have five million more Muslims added to the sixty or seventy million Muslims who are already in India, and with whose treatment you are familiar. So, it is not a question of India's territorial aggrandizement or of wanting the people to be a part of the Indian Union. Nor is it a question of the resources of the State of Jammu and Kashmir. India holds on to the State of Jammu and Kashmir because she thinks that, by holding on to the State of Jammu and Kashmir, it will destroy Pakistan. This is a clear and obvious manifestation of India's intentions. That is the intent and the purpose with which India wants to subjugate Kashmir. By subjugating Kashmir, India would want to subjugate Pakistan; because by controlling the State of Jammu and Kashmir, India believes that she holds the life-blood of Pakistan, the rivers of Pakistan. She believes that strategically she can dominate Pakistan. She believes that by subjugating the Muslims of Jammu and Kashmir, she can blackmail and intimidate Pakistan. Therefore, India's occupation of Jammu and

Kashmir is only a stage, is only a part of India's intentions to subjugate and destroy Pakistan itself.

Sir, since 1962 India, emboldened by the massive military assistance she has received from various quarters, has taken many provocative measures culminating in the invasion of Pakistan on the 6th of September, 1965. On the 16th of October, 1963, the Indian forces tried to occupy Chaknot, which ever since the cease-fire had been in the administrative jurisdiction of Azad Kashmir. Only after the Pakistan Government clearly indicated its firm resolve to resist Indian incursion, did India abandon that threat. Then, Sir, in the middle of May, 1965, India occupied the isolated Pakistan outpost in the Kargil sector in the State of Jammu and Kashmir. While making our determination to repel Indian aggression in the area, we first appealed to the United Nations, in consistence with our peaceful policy. India vacillated for two months, but then she had to agree to vacate those posts. Here I would like to focus on the significance of Indian occupation of Kargil post. India stepped across the cease-fire line even when there was no excuse of the so-called infiltration. The Indian violation of the cease-fire line and occupation of Kargil three months before the uprising in India—held Kashmir is a positive proof of the Indian intention of conquest of Azad Kashmir. When the people of Jammu and Kashmir, in sheer desperation, took up arms against Indian colonialism and rose in revolt on 9th August, the twelfth anniversary of the first arrest of Shaikh Abdullah, the Indian Government found it necessary to coin some excuse. It would have been against India's nature to admit honestly that, despite India's control over the state for about 18 years, the people of Jammu and Kashmir remained unreconciled to Indian rule. India refused to admit that it was her own obduracy and repression which had sown the wind, and the uprising was the whirlwind she now had to reap. Instead, India yielded to a customary inclination, and put the blame for the popular uprising on outsiders. Since India has spared no effort to mislead the world about the freedom fighters, I want to make it clear once again that these brave men are the sons of the soil. The Indian propaganda that they are members of the Azad Kashmir or Pakistan Army is a lie. The freedom fighters are Kashmiris who have offered to give the highest sacrifice in order to liberate their homeland from the clutches of the Indian invader. It may be that some person from the Azad Kashmir area have slipped across the cease-fire line to join their brethren in Indian-held Kashmir in the fight against Indian colonialism. If so, they had the right to do so. And if the one hundred thousand Indian troops in Jammu and Kashmir could not prevent these people, whose numbers could not be very large, from crossing over, it would be inadmissible for India to expect Pakistan to be India's policeman. I would go further than saying that the people of Azad Kashmir have

the right to join the freedom fighters in the Indian-held Jammu and Kashmir. I would add that the people of Pakistan have every right to help and support their brethren in Jammu and Kashmir. In fact, in this war we have proved that we shall give and make any sacrifice, but we will never give up our support to the just cause and the just right of the people of Jammu and Kashmir to self-determination. The uprising in Jammu and Kashmir gave India pretext to try again to implement her design of the conquest of Azad Kashmir. The Indian Prime Minister declared boastfully in the Indian Parliament in mid-August:

"India has crossed the cease-fire line in the past, and would do so again."

Now, the first part of the statement is an admission of fact for a change and indication of India's pre-plan to cross over into Azad Kashmir. As the Indian Prime Minister uttered these words, the Indian Army went into action. On the 16th August the Indian Army again occupied the outpost in Kargil. On 23rd August the Indian forces shelled the village of Awan Sharif in West Pakistan from the Indian-held Kashmir, causing death of 25 men, women and children, and injuries and destruction of property. On 24th August the Indian troops crossed the cease-fire line again, and occupied two posts in the Titwal sector on the Pakistan side of the line. On August 24 the Indians crossed the cease-fire line in the Uri-Poonch sector, and occupied Bejore on the Pakistan side of the cease-fire line. Towards the end of August, the Indian Army launched a major operation in the Uri-Poonch sector, and on 31st of August occupied Haji Pir Pass, deep inside our territory. Simultaneously the Indian occupation army in Jammu and Kashmir intensified the axe of repression which, in their scope and nature, threatened to assume the proportions of genocide. By these acts of aggression and grave violation of the cease-fire agreement, the Indians reduced the cease-fire line to a nullity, and created a situation in which the rights of the people of Jammu and Kashmir as well as the security of Pakistan were gravely threatened.

Consistent with our peaceful policy, the Government of Pakistan patiently drew the attention of the United Nations to these serious violations of the cease-fire line by India, but in vain. We also appealed to the great powers to restrain India, but without effect. This was the situation that faced Pakistan as the eventful month of August drew to a close. India was bent upon following the collision course; there was a grab of Kashmir's territory and neither the United Nations nor the great powers came to restrain her. Already India on 24th August had shelled the village of Awan Sharif, one mile inside Pakistan territory from across Jammu and Kashmir, killing, as I said, 25 innocent persons. She should have known better. It should thus be clear that Pakistan was left with no choice except to

resist Indian aggression against the State of Jammu and Kashmir, and Pakistan decided to act and on 1st September Azad Kashmir forces backed by Pakistan Army crossed the case-fire line, for the first time in eighteen years, in the Bhimber sector in the State of Jammu and Kashmir. The policy of our Government was a policy of restraint but evidently India was bent upon escalating the aggression. It should be noted that in each and every stage of escalation, it was India that took the initiative. India was the first to violate cease-fire line; the first in May and then repeatedly in August. India was the first to launch a massive attack on the towns and strategic locations in the territory of Azad Kashmir. India was the first to induct the Air Force into the fighting and on 1st September the Indian Army straffed our base in the Bhimber sector. Our Air Force then went into action and, as you know, inflicted heavy losses on Indian Air Force. And finally India was the first to launch aggression across the international boundaries between India and Pakistan and to extend thus the field of conflict outside the disputed State of Jammu and Kashmir.

Now, Sir, I have given a background of the conflict as well as the various measures taken by India to intensify the conflict and to culminate it into a war of aggression against Pakistan. We have been subjected to aggression; we have gone through a momentous period; we have gone through a painful period of vicissitudes; we have seen the might of Indian army poised against our territory. Our people have defended their homeland; they have repulsed the Indian aggression. But if India thinks that by a policy of intimidation and by a policy of aggression she can thrust her might and power against Pakistan—she cannot forget the spirit and power of resistance of the people of Pakistan—then she is sadly mistaken. The spirit, the indomitable spirit, and the will of the people of Pakistan can never be broken. The hundred million Pakistanis will never compromise on the inalienable right of the people of Jammu and Kashmir to self-determination. This is our pledge made in honour as a sovereign people; and one aggression may come after another; one attack may come after another; we shall fight them everywhere; we shall fight them on our own territory; we shall fight them on their territory, if necessary, if they attack us. We shall continue the struggle dauntlessly and fearlessly irrespective of the consequences and irrespective of the odds. The Indian Government can never intimidate the people of Pakistan by their aggression against Pakistan. We have established our equality, for all times to come, with the Government and the people of India; and come what may, we shall never surrender; ours is the righteous cause; it is a just cause. The people of Jammu and Kashmir cannot be an exception to the process of decolonization. I ask you, Sir, if the people of Jammu and Kashmir alone in the whole wide world could be an exception to liberty and independence. Mighty

empires of Britain, France and other great powers were pitted against helpless people who have been fighting for their independence, yet people throughout Asia and Africa have gained their freedom; they have been faced with overwhelming odds; history is replete with examples of valour and courage of those who upheld the righteous cause. The British had to abandon their empire in India and in other parts of Asia and Africa and gradually the process of decolonization is coming to its perfection. There are left now only small pockets of colonialism, which will also be eliminated in due course.

The struggle for independence in the whole world has been the same. That is why we in Pakistan feel as deeply for the people of Jammu and Kashmir as we do for the people of Southern Rhodesia. There is no difference in the struggle of the oppressed people for independence. The people's struggle for liberty and freedom is not confined by geographical separation or by any historical facts. You see in South Rhodesia a coterie of people, a handful of minority trying to oppress the majority community. You see in the State of Jammu and Kashmir a coterie of people trying to suppress the people of Jammu and Kashmir. This cannot be. It is against the course of history ; it is against the rules of morality; it is against the conscience of humanity. Therefore, people everywhere must be free, irrespective of the odds.

If India thinks that she can suppress and dominate the people of Kashmir and hold them in perpetuity, she has forgotten the history. The more you suppress the people, the more they will rise gloriously against oppression. The more she commits genocide, the more the people will resist Indian oppression. We speak of the Ghetto of Poland and of genocide of Czechoslovakia, of the oppression of the Jews. But are the people of Jammu and Kashmir any different? Are the ghettos of Jammu and Kashmir not stinking to high heavens as they were stinking in Europe at the time of Hitler? And if Hitler and his army, his force and power were defeated because in the end right must prevail, then also the people of Jammu and Kashmir will attain their inalienable right and nothing in the world can prevent them from doing it. It is the duty of the people of Pakistan to redeem this pledge. We shall continue to fight for the redemption of this pledge. It is not one struggle; it is not just one moment in history. We must continue; we must struggle and drive out the rulers of India from Jammu and Kashmir. We want peace, but we want peace with honour, a peace which is a just cause and an honourable peace. We have pledged to fight against oppression, against tyranny, against exploitation, against domination of the Indian war-lords. As an honourable sovereign state we have no other honourable choice but to withhold the cause of the people of Kashmir in the name of justice, against oppression, against tyranny and against domination.

Speech in the National Assembly on November 20, 1965

Lessons from the Crisis—World Support—Indian Threat to Great Powers—Relations with U.S. and Soviet Union—Kashmir Dispute—Soviet Union's Good Offices—Malaysia—UN Resolutions—Confrontation with India

I would like to express the Government's gratification to the Leader of the Opposition and to the Members of the Opposition for the patriotic, united and steadfast support that they have given to the Government in this gravest national emergency that has faced Pakistan. Their co-operation and sense of understanding have, indeed, been a source of inspiration to the Government. It is not possible for a few people who compose the Government to face such difficult and Himalayan responsibilities without the combined support of all the people in the country; and by the patriotic stand that the Opposition leaders and members have taken, they have demonstrated beyond any doubt that the nation stands indivisibly united for meeting this grave emergency that faces our beloved country. The whole nation, Sir, stands united, and there can be no doubt about it; and this, Sir, is our greatest source of comfort and satisfaction. We are pitted against a mighty and powerful neighbour; but because this nation stands firmly united, courageously united, we are able to meet the overwhelming odds that we face bravely and with a sense of confidence and courage.

Sir, this crisis has taught us many lessons. At a time of trial people discover many facets of their individual and collective character. This crisis has shown that the fact of East Pakistan being separated by a thousand miles of alien territory is in no way a deterrent or impediment to the solidarity and unity of Pakistan. This crisis has shown that East and West Pakistan are the two mighty and dynamic pillars of Islam galvanized against the decadent society of India. (Thumping) Our brethren from Bengal, from the distant lands, have stood shoulder to shoulder with the soldiers in the battlefront, in the trenches of the Lahore sector and the Sialkot front.

They have fought courageously and honourably to protect the sacred soil of Pakistan. The Pathans have shown their traditional valour; the Baluchs have fought bravely; the desert people of Sind, the Hurs, have held their ramparts in the deserts of Rajasthan and Sind heroically; the refugees who are Pakistanis in every sense of the word have shown their valour and the greatest devotion and love for the country, and above all, Sir, Punjab has shown that it is the sword arm of the sub-continent. The bravery and valour which the people of Lahore and Sialkot demonstrated in this crisis leaves no doubt in any one's mind that these are the people who were capable of fighting and struggling against the combined onslaught of the British and Indian majority community for the creation of Pakistan which was then regarded as an impossible task. No task is impossible for them; every task they are capable of achieving.

The Armed Forces of Pakistan, to whom glowing tributes have rightly been paid by every member of this House, have also shown that they are amongst the finest fighting material that the world has known. It is not possible for an army to withstand a massive offensive which is launched by an enemy. A very momentous aggression is capable of meeting its own objectives. Here the Indian army was held at bay. It was made to stand still in spite of the fact that it had launched a treacherous and massive attack at the nerve centre of Pakistan. The fact that Lahore which is only fifteen to sixteen miles from the Indian frontiers was protected and saved from the Indian army, was in itself a great achievement. The tributes which the people of Pakistan paid to the Armed Forces of Pakistan were rightly paid. We have known that in the past the capture of important centres had pervading influence on the conduct of war. We have seen how Napoleon who swept across Russia was unable to go beyond Moscow although he went deep along with his army into Russian territory; the fact that he returned empty-handed in spite of the territory his forces had taken, showed that they had been defeated. Similarly the fact that Hitler in the last war penetrated deep into the Soviet territory but was unable to take Moscow showed that he had been defeated. Here it was demonstrated that the Indian army was not capable of achieving the objective of taking Lahore as it was held at bay, held at its own frontiers. It was a magnificent achievement of the people and the Armed Forces of Pakistan. Our war is a people's war. The Indians may have bigger army, they may overwhelm us in numbers, but they must know that as far as Pakistan is concerned, they will have to fight every man, woman and child of Pakistan; they will have to fight in the streets, in the houses and in the villages of Dacca, Chittagong, Lahore, Kalat, every part of Pakistan, before they can consider themselves victorious. It is just not possible. The Indian war-lords must know that the defeat of Pakistan is impossible. Just as they were unable to prevent the creation of Pakistan, so also it is

absolutely impossible for them to think that Pakistan will ever be defeated by the Indian hordes merely because of superior numbers or because they have an army which has been supported from various sources and augmented by various countries.

Sir, as I have said, the nation has been united and has stood like steel. We have also received overwhelming support from the world and I underscore 'overwhelming'. It has truly been overwhelming and in contradistinction India stood alone and isolated. This is an admission which the Prime Minister of India made to his own nation. The greatest and most spontaneous support came to Pakistan from the downtrodden, under-privileged and oppressed proletarian nations of Asia and Africa. This is natural because the pain that we felt is the pain they feel. They know our struggle is a struggle for decolonization, just as their own struggle has been for decolonization. The nations of Asia and Africa know what it means to be oppressed; what it means to be tyrannized; they know how a people must face bravely and courageously, whatever odds, a wanton and monstrous aggressor, because they also have faced aggression. Our experience is common with them. We have made the same struggle, and, as Mr. Mashiur Rahman said, this is a collective struggle; indeed, this is a collective struggle. There is no difference whatsoever in the process of decolonization in Jammu and Kashmir, in Southern Rhodesia or in any other part of Asia and Africa. That is why the nations of Asia and Africa were in the forefront, in the vanguard of the movement for the support of Pakistan. They knew that Pakistan was suffering in the way they have suffered, that our call for justice was their call for justice; our call for redress of the people's rights in Jammu and Kashmir was also their cry and their struggle which they also made heroically against superior odds, against overwhelming numbers. That is why the nations of Asia and Africa were in the forefront, in the vanguard of the support that Pakistan received in its struggle against the aggression that India launched against Pakistan.

Sir, I would be failing in my duty if I do not refer to some of the countries which gave us outright support in our struggle. This is not an easy undertaking. Sir, other nations have their own problems and difficulties to consider before they can commit themselves without qualification, without reservation for a just and an honourable cause. Sometimes we should ask ourselves the question: Suppose two countries, far away from our frontiers, are engaged in the struggle, and although we may have sympathy with one against the other, will it be easy for our nation to commit itself or do the same thing that others have done for us? Sir, it is from this point of view that I would like to refer to the support that we received outright and without reservations from a number of countries in Asia and Africa.

Iran and Turkey gave us unqualified support and, Sir, it is with some

pride and satisfaction that I wish to mention that our R.C.D. partners, the great Iranian and Turkish nations, stood by us and rendered moral and material support to us in the time of crisis against Indian aggression. Iran declared: "The Iranian Government and people with all the moral and material resources at their command stand ready to support Pakistan in this hour of most urgent need to safeguard her territorial integrity and political sovereignty." A large number of Iranians volunteered to fight the Indian aggression side by side with Pakistan. Iranian nurses came to serve the wounded Pakistani soldiers. The Iranian Prime Minister flew to Ankara to consult the Turkish Prime Minister as to how best they could assist us in our fight against Indian aggression. In a communique issued after the meeting the Iranian and Turkish Prime Ministers declared on 11th September, 1965: "The initiation by India of large scale military operations across the internationally recognized border of Pakistan threatens peace not only in the region but throughout the world." They added: "As long as the Jammu and Kashmir dispute remains unsolved, the recurrence of such a grave situation cannot be ruled out and (they) reaffirm the solidarity which links Turkey, Iran and Pakistan and declare that they are ready to support Pakistan, a brother, an ally Pakistan". The Iranian Prime Minister and the Turkish Foreign Minister came to Pakistan to consult the Pakistan leaders and the Pakistan Government about the assistance they could give to Pakistan. On the diplomatic front, Iranian and Turkish Governments supported and advocated Pakistan's case. The Turkish President wrote to President Johnson and Prime Minister Harold Wilson. The Iranian Ambassadors in London and Washington, under instructions from their Government, took up the question with those Governments as if it was their own question. The veteran Turkish leader, Mr. Ismat Inonu, who fought the battle of independence along with Kamal Ataturk in Turkey to repel the aggression on Turkish soil and helped in making modern Turkey, said: "The aggression launched against Pakistan is downright unjustified. This aggression is aimed at usurping Pakistan's legitimate right over Jammu and Kashmir which has been irreputably handed over to India. This is again totally unjustified." The fullest support which we have received from the Government of Iran and Turkey during our trial doubly shows the solidarity of the RCD countries, and it cemented further the bonds of friendship, brotherhood and common understanding.

I now, Sir, refer to the great and glorious support which Pakistan received from the Republic of Indonesia, and here, Sir, I can do no better than recall the words of President Ahmad Soekarno. President Soekarno while addressing the Islamic Unity Party on September 13th said: "President Soekarno on behalf of the Indonesian people has deliberately chosen to side with Pakistan in its conflict with India because in this struggle there is justice in

the cause for which Pakistan is fighting." He said, "Do not be like Malaysia and say, we are friends of both, therefore, neutral. There is no neutrality when a principle is involved. There is no compromise when truth is there. I say to those foreign correspondents and diplomats who are present here to carry my words and dispatch them to all corners, for truth is here manifest and must be supported against Indian aggression." Indonesia, Sir, with its one hundred million people or more has been a tower of strength during our trial, which has forged unshakable bonds of loyalty, love, partnership and brotherhood. The unreserved support given by the people of Indonesia has touched the innermost core of our heart and built a reservoir of good will and love amongst all our people. In acknowledging in the General Assembly of the United Nations on the 28th of September the support that the people of Indonesia gave to Pakistan, I voiced the feelings of the people of Pakistan when I said: "From this rostrum permit me on behalf of the Government and the people of Pakistan to pay a lasting tribute to the President of Indonesia, to the Government of Indonesia and to the great people of Indonesia who gave us their unstinted support in our hour of trial. The people of Pakistan shall not forget the true friendship given by the Indonesian President and the Indonesian people. The bonds that bind our people have been tested in this crisis and have become stronger."

Mr. Speaker, Sir, I now come to another great and powerful Asian country which gave Pakistan unstinted support. That is the People's Republic of China.

China reacted immediately and spontaneously to Indian aggression against Pakistan and condemned this unprovoked attack as well as India's suppression of the freedom struggle of the Kashmiri people in the strongest terms. A statement issued by the Chinese Government on 7 September 1965 declared *inter alia:*

> "India's aggression against any one of its neighbours concerns all its neighbours."

The statement also expressed confidence that "with the sympathy and support of the peace-loving countries and the peoples of Asia and the whole world, the one hundred million people of Pakistan will rise as one man to save their country and finally (throw) back Indian aggressors. The Chinese Government also reaffirm its support to the right of self-determination of the people of Jammu and Kashmir on which the Indian Government had given commitments to Pakistan and to the people of Jammu and Kashmir."

Throughout the period of conflict Chinese Government and people continued to support Pakistan's heroic resistance and offered to give Pakistan all assistance in its just struggle. This consistent support from a great power with a population of seven hundred million people was a source of great encouragement to Pakistan.

And here again from the rostrum of the UN General Assembly I acknowledged the support which the People's Republic of China gave to Pakistan. I declared:

"Our great neighbour to the North, People's Republic of China, gave us full moral support and, rising high above ideological differences, upheld the cause of righteousness and condemned the war of aggression launched against us by India."

Sir, the support which the People's Republic of China in this great crisis gave to Pakistan is, indeed, a matter of great significance for a number of reasons. First of all, by any definition of the term, China is a great power. She is a great power in the sense that she has a right to occupy her place in the Security Council of the United Nations as a Permanent Member. She is a great power because she possesses atomic weapons like other great powers and is now one of the nuclear powers. She is a great power because there can be no meaningful disarmament in the world without the participation of China. She is a great power because no important dispute of Asia can be settled without the co-operation and participation of the People's Republic of China. So, the support that we got from this great power is, indeed, significant and meaningful.

In addition to the support we have received from the People's Republic of China, we have had support from other Asian countries like Ceylon. The Prime Minister of Ceylon declared in the Ceylonese Parliament that Indian aggression against Pakistan was deplorable. The Leader of the Opposition, Madam Bandranayaka, condemned Indian aggression against Pakistan. We have received support from the Philippines, from Japan, from North Vietnam and from the people of Afghanistan. In every Afghan home there were prayers for Pakistan and they felt the struggle to be their own struggle. According to the *Newsweek*, Afghans condemned the wanton Indian attack on Pakistan. They considered it as their own cause and as their own fight. We would like to pay a lasting tribute to the people of that great country who stood by us and supported us and sympathised with us in the moment of great crisis.

Sir, the whole of the Arab world for the first time collectively supported our position on Jammu and Kashmir at Casablanca. The Casablanca Resolution will go down as a historic document. It created complete disillusionment and frustration in India. The Indian leaders had begun to use their usual tactics of blackmail and threats on the Arab Governments by saying that they could respond more constructively and positively to Israel if the Arab countries pursued their support to Pakistan. But the Arab Governments were not deterred, and collectively at Casablanca there was a resoultion in support of the just and honourable settlement of Jammu and Kashmir dispute. We pay homage and we show our gratitude to the great

Arab world with whom we have unbreakable religious, historical and cultural ties. In particular it is necessary for us to mention the overwhelming support we received from Saudi Arabia, Syria and Jordan, both inside and outside the Security Council, (cheers) and from Sudan, Iraq, Morocco, Tunisia, and, above all, Algeria which is the beaconlight of the people's right to self-determination.

I would also like to mention the whole-hearted support we received from Albania. The outright and completely unreserved support which Pakistan got from Iran, Turkey, Syria, Saudi Arabia, Jordan, Iraq, Morocco, Tunisia, Algeria, Sudan, Albania, China and Indonesia is the support of more than half of humanity. In terms of nations it numbers a dozen or more. But in terms of people (and in final and ultimate analysis it is the people who matter) more than half of humanity stand shoulder to shoulder with Pakistan in its just struggle.

In Africa also we received overwhelming support and sympathy in the Security Council. The representative of Ivory Coast in the Security Council compared India to South Africa. I think it is a valid and objective comparison, because India is to Asia what South Africa is to Africa. We received support from Somalia, Niegeria, Tanzania, Togo, Mali and Senegal, and from many of the other African states.

Now I go to the distant continent of Latin America, with whom we have hardly any contact. We have only one Mission in Brazil. That is all we have in the whole of Latin America whereas India has diplomatic representation in Brazil, Argentina, Venezuela, Mexico, Cuba and a number of other Latin American countries. But in spite of the fact that Latin America is far away and we hardly have any contact with that great continent, nonetheless, on the question of Jammu and Kashmir, the Latin American states have always given us deep and profound support. Whenever the question of Jammu and Kashmir has gone to the Security Council we have received support from Latin America because here it is not a question of contact or diplomatic relations, but the fundamental and uncompromisable question of self-determination is involved. That is why in spite of India's efforts and in spite of India's forensic and strenuous ways and methods, the states of Latin America have supported us in the Security Council. This time the representative of Uruguay who was the President of the Security Council had this to say:

> "If we have a wounded bleeding foot we have to apply anaesthesia and cure it. We have to get over the crisis. It is true, but would it be wise or sufficient to do all that and then merely replace the foot in the same shoe. If there is still the nail in the shoe which causes difficulty and immediately reopens the same wound what would be gained. How can we consider logically the resistance to coming face to face with the cause

of the crisis if no guarantee is given that at least it would call for immediate attention of the Security Council".

And then he went on to say:

"In 1948 and 1957 the Security Council established Commissions and entrusted the President of the Council to collect direct information on the spot. This experience was fruitful. If such action was opportune my delegation would support the entrusting to our President or to a special Three-man Committee the task of gathering impressions on the situation in Jammu and Kashmir without possessing the power to investigate".

"Shortly the Security Council is to discuss other problems concerning the self-determination of people. Its legal authority and moral and political strength are increased depending on the attitudes and the conduct adopted. What the Council may say or do regarding the lamentable situation confronting us will have a direct bearing on the situation with which Council may have to deal tomorrow."

These were the words of the representative of Uruguay.

This shows the strength of our cause. Although our resources are limited, we don't have diplomatic missions in every country as India has, we don't have the resources or the power to propagate our ideas in every corner of the world, there is no contact with all the countries of the world, yet all the countries, even those as far away as Uruguay, have come in support of the right to self-determination of the people of Jammu and Kashmir. This shows how much strength the people of Pakistan have on the question of Kashmir. If Pakistan were to be isolated, we would know the difficulties of isolation. Therefore, please appreciate the strength and the value of international support. India, which is wholly and totally isolated, laments the fact of its isolation. Whereas Pakistan, which is upholding a righteous cause, which has not abandoned the cause of Kashmir, is mustering greater and greater support throughout the world. These are mostly the pillars of our strength in the liberation of the people of Jammu and Kashmir.

In Eastern Europe also more and more states are getting directly interested and involved, in this matter. Almost everybody now believes that there must be a settlement of the Jammu and Kashmir dispute. A few years ago Eastern Europe was blank to us. There are countries in other parts of the world with which we do not have any contact, but Eastern Europe is not far away from us; and yet a few years ago Eastern Europe was blank to us. We had no contact with it, we had no trade and dealings with it, whereas India had made strong efforts to penetrate Eastern Europe, like Czechoslovakia Rumania and others, where they had diplomatic relations and we had no contact whatsoever. For us the rest of the world was two or three countries, or perhaps one country. There was no other world except that, and now that we have made efforts and established contacts and propagated our

views and explained the righteousness of our cause that we are the aggrieved party, there is more and more sympathy and support in Eastern Europe and the Scandinavian countries.

The Foreign Minister of Rumania had useful discussions with me on the dispute of Jammu and Kashmir, and I hope from Moscow I will be able to pay a day's visit to Rumania as well. There is a greater realization of our cause in Kashmir throughout the world, even in Eastern Europe with which although we are close, we have had no contact so far. Now we are trying to get universal support on the question of Jammu and Kashmir.

I now come to Western Europe and without casting any aspersion or showing any disrespect for any great country of Western Europe, I must say that two important countries, *viz.*, France and West Germany, supported Pakistan on the question of the right to self-determination of the people of Jammu and Kashmir. The other countries of Western Europe also supported us. West Germany again and again said that on the question of self-determination there can be no compromise. France, another great power, a member of the Security Council and one which played an exceptionally constructive and positive role in the Security Council both in September as well as in November—true to the great traditions of France, the mother of all revolutions and the mother of fraternity, equality and freedom, has taken a positive, courageous and right stand on the dispute of Jammu and Kashmir.

You must also, Sir, remember France's position in the present-day world. Today France has got an exceptional influence in Africa, especially amongst the French-speaking African states. France occupies a unique position in the heart of Europe. Apart from her influence in Eastern Europe as well as with the Soviet Union, France has established sepecial relations with China in Asia, and it believes that no problem or no dispute of Asia can really be permanently settled without the participation of the People's Republic of China. As in Asia the great power of Asia supported us on the dispute of Jammu and Kashmir, so in Europe France and Germany supported the right to self-determination of the people of Jammu and Kashmir. So much so that when Madam Pandit visited Paris and met General De Gaulle, after the meeting with him, she held a press conference and expressed her disappointment saying that it was unfortunate that people there did not appreciate India's position.

But what is unfortunate about that? What is there to appreciate about India's position that she has to lament that the people of the world do not appreciate the Indian position? We know India is sending delegations helter-skelter throughout the world, but what purpose will it serve? It will only help in exposing the Indian perfidy. What explanation will they offer to the countries that they are visiting? Will they tell them that they enter into international agreements and it is their right to break those international

agreements? Will they tell them that no pledge was given to the peole of Jammu and Kashmir for exercising the right to self-determination? It is no use saying Kashmir is an integral part of India. That is not going to make Kashmir an integral part of India. Kashmir cannot become an integral part of India.

The United Kingdom has also maintained its traditional position on the Jammu and Kashmir dispute and it must be said to the credit of the United Kingdom that the Prime Minister of United Kingdom condemned in no uncertain terms the Indian aggression on the territory of Pakistan. On his condemning India's aggression on Pakistan, what has been the reaction in India? In India Indian leaders have threatened to leave the Commonwealth. They have threatened to nationalize British assets in India. Now the British, of all the foreign powers, know the Indians quite well. They have had about two-hundred years dealings with them. They know that these are empty threats. These threats cannot be implemented. India has not great love for the Commonwealth. It is in the Commonwealth merely because Pakistan is in the Commonwealth and India will remain in the Commonwealth as long as Pakistan is there. What is good for the goose is good for the gander. If India can quit the Commonwealth merely because the British have taken the side of the righteous cause, then Pakistan has also the same right; but in spite of our many differences with Great Britain—on the partition there were anomalies which were perpetrated against Pakistan—Pakistan has not taken the position that with every turn, every adjustment of the situation we should threaten to leave the Commonwealth, or threaten to take such action as we have no intention of taking.

Also, the Prime Minister of India, Mr. Shastri, has said that if the great powers, including the United States, were to try and impose a settlement of the Jammu and Kashmir dispute, they will have nothing to do with the great powers. Prime Minister Shastri, who goes about as a little Nepoleon throughout India, says that he will have nothing to do with the great powers if they tried to impose a settlement of the Jammu and Kashmir dispute. Let us ponder over that, Mr. Speaker. India, which receives 9 million tons of foodgrains from the United States of America every year, which means 20,000 tons per day, is solely dependent upon them for economic assistance as well as military assistance. These assistances are understandable. All under-developed countries require economic assistance from more opulent countries. There is nothing shameful about it because these loans are repaid, because it is not averse to sovereignty, but it is strange for a country like India to give such a threat to the big powers, when its own fragile, poverty-stricken and miserable people have no food; and yet for a colonial ambition on the State of Jammu and Kashmir, the Indians should have the audacity to turn round and say that they would have nothing to do with the big

powers if they tried and brought about justice.

Now suppose the United States of America were to impress upon India to come to a fair settlement about Jammu and Kashmir. What is immoral about it? If the United States or any other great power impresses upon India to do that, it would not be doing something immoral or reprehensible or wrong. So, if Pakistan tells U.S.A. that it must use its influence to settle this dispute because it promised itself that the people of Jammu and Kashmir, like any other people, would have the right to self-determination, what is wrong in it? If the U.S. is asked to exercise her influence because objectively self-determination is involved, because by using her influence she could bring peace and tranquillity and happiness to the people of the sub-continent, which means over 500 million people, where is any immorality involved? Where is the question of using influence in the wrong direction involved? If, of course, the United States were to say to India that they must give away part of India like Madras or certain other part to some other country, then it would be different. If there was something wrong, one could understand. But here the U.S. could use her great and powerful influence fairly. Is that unjust or immoral? Because when she used her influence in the right direction even the people of India would be finally grateful to her for doing so. They would be grateful to all those powers who used their influence in the right direction which will bring peace to the sub-continent, which will alleviate misery, which will bring an end to exploitation, genocide, human misery, human rancour, savagery and brutalities that are being committed in the State. All this will be put to an end. Is that not the just and moral obligation of the whole world, including the great powers?

Sir, a country like India is dependent on the United States for 900 million tons of foodgrains a year and economic assistance. India's economic situation today is in a critical state. It is almost facing bankruptcy. It is dependent on the economic assistance of the United States and, to a lesser extent, of the U.S.S.R., and it requires and needs military assistance in addition. If the great powers were to use their influence positively and constructively to bring about peace and happiness for 500 million people, it would not be an immoral or unjustified exercise of influence. They have to adopt a moral position in this matter. If the great powers can determine the future of Europe, if they can take a blue pencil and decide that this part goes to U.S.S.R., Czechoslovakia, Germany and others—this is what happened at Yalta Conference—if they can have Yalta Conference to bring about peace which nobody respects, is not an honourable peace more desirable? Why cannot they have the same Yalta concept for Asia? Is there any difference between Europeans and Asians? Is peace not as important to Asia as it is to Europe? Is misery any different for people of Asia than it is for people of Europe? Is genocide any different, when it was perpetrated

by Hitler against European Jews, and when it is being perpetrated against Kashmiris of Jammu and Kashmir? Do we not feel pain in the same way as people of Europe feel? Are not tears of the same colour? Do they not come from the same eyes whether they are Asian eyes or European eyes? Is there not need that there should be the same inhibition to compel India to do the right thing, to compel India to face international conscience, to give to the people of Jammu and Kashmir the right to self-determination which they have pledged to them?

The United States position in this crisis has been mentioned eloquently both by the Leader of the House and by the Leader of the Opposition, and by a number of members of the House. I do not want to repeat what has been said. It is true that in the last three years fortuitously and due to circumstances it has been my responsibility to shoulder the crisis and to articulate Pakistan's pains and pangs in respect of the United States policy towards this country. But this is a duty which I owe not only to Government but also to a hundred million people of Pakistan. I have carried out this responsibility and I have been carrying it on courageously and with conviction. Pakistan has done no wrong to the United States of America. I would want any objective person to tabulate the grievances of the United States of America against Pakistan, and I would want, not an objective person, but even a child to tabulate the grievances we have against the United States, and let it be an unequal tabulation. Let it be, on the one hand, a scholar and, on the other, a child because whatever has happened in the last two to three years has been unfortunately directed against the vital interests of Pakistan culminating in the aggression which was launched by India against us. Had it not been for the military augmentation of India's war machinery, India would never have dared to launch an aggression against Pakistan. And we feared this all the time. We have not gone mad, we have not lost our sense that we should unnecessarily have a policy of strain and stress with a great country like the United States of America with whom we share a special relationship. I know that some of the members of the Opposition, and understandably, have said that it is necessary to have good relations with all the great powers. But this is also a truism. It is obvious that it is necessary to have good relations with all the great powers. Who does not want that? That has been our very purpose. It has been our endeavour all the time. This has been our effort. But at the same time you must weight equities; you must put them in a balance; you must see changed realities; you must have objective considerations; you must see changes in policies. After-all policies are dynamic, they are not permanent. It is not that the United States of America had some special love and romance for Pakistan, therefore its global policies should not change. How could this Government be held responsible if the United

States global policies changed, which brought about a certain stress and strain in our relationship. This Government would be all the more anxious to have a solid good relationship with the United States of America for the simple reason that we have pursued our foreign policy of establishing good relations with the whole world.

I am not being critical of any government because this is a time of national crisis. I am just mentioning the factual position. Up to 1958 we had no contact, I repeat, no contact with the great power like the Soviet Union. Was that right and realistic that we should have had no relations with a great powerhouse—my ambassador to Moscow describes the Soviet Union as a powerhouse to the north—so close to Pakistan, a great power with all its resources and industrial potential, with all its ability to help and support any other country? With them we had no contacts at all, absolutely none. It was for the first time in 1961 that we established our first economic agreement with the Soviet Union. Is that not shameful that our foreign policy was so geared that we had put all the eggs in one basket? Is it realistic not to have any relations with the Soviet Union? How many times Pandit Nehru visited the Soviet Union? How many Indian delegations went to U.S.S.R.? What special efforts were made by Indian leaders to establish special relations with the Soviet Union? You must check all that, in the totality of events, in its historical perspective. It is all very well to say why this Government did not get support from the Soviet Union? You have to consider the historical situation. Despite that in respect of the Soviet Union this Government has made profound changes and our relations with the Soviet Union have improved vastly. There is a great improvement in our relations with the Soviet Union now. If we want to improve our relations with a country with whom we had no contacts, surely it follows that we would like to consolidate our relations with a country with whom we already had good relations. We had made from 1958 to 1962 great efforts. Please consider all the measures that this Government took to establish good relations and to consolidate good relations with the United States of America. This is the same Government composed of Field-Marshal Mohammad Ayub Khan and his cabinet although the Cabinet may have changed from person to person. What happened from 1958 to 1962? This Government went even further than other Governments in establishing good relations with the United States of America. Despite that India is our mortal enemy, India is determined to destroy us, but in view of the global interest of the United States of America we made special efforts from 1958 to 1962 to have good relations with India also, in the interest and in the enhancement of the global policy of the United States of America. But a time comes when the people have to cry halt and say thus far and no further, if it comes to jeopardizing the interest of a country.

This is all that we have done and said to the United States that by arming India, by giving to India teeth, by giving India military might and military power, all that will happen is that all those guns will be directed against Pakistan and against no other country. In doing so strains have been created. We are sad, we are unhappy, we do not like it, but we cannot abandon our national security, we cannot abandon our national rights. This is the position of the people of Pakistan and it is in this context and in these circumstances that the President of Pakistan is going to visit the United States of America. Our hands are clean, our conscience is clear. We have nothing to conceal. We are the aggrieved party. Let us discuss it. Let us discuss it a thousand times. Be it at Presidential level or at any level because an appraisal will show that not only we are not opposed to America but our apprehensions have come out true and it has been justified by the lives and the blood that has been shed for these seventeen days. These seventeen days which shook the sub-continent need not have taken place—we would not have shaken the sub-continent had it not been for the arrogance of India—but they were brought about by Indian arrogance which came about because India believes that it has the military might and the military potential and it has an armada and the force to destroy Pakistan. But India can never destroy Pakistan even if India gets help from the whole world. It is just not possible to destroy and decimate a valiant and a valorous nation of a hundred million. I would like to tell the House that India wants to raise thirty Divisions for this purpose. India can have sixty Divisions if it wants. India wants an atom bomb at Trombay. It can have its Trombays but even then it cannot intimidate Pakistan. If India wants to have an atom bomb, let her have the bomb because, as Mr. Sobur has said, there are such things as paper tigers. But to use the word 'tiger' in the context of India is not correct. Even if you say paper tiger, do not use the word 'tiger' in that context. It is inconceivable, it is not possible. However, if India is to have an atom bomb, the people of Pakistan will be prepared to eat grass, but they will also have an atom bomb.

Now, Sir, I would like to say that on the Jammu and Kashmir dispute you cannot take a neutral attitude. It is not possible to take a neutral attitude in a situation where there is an aggressor and an aggressed, where there is an oppressor and an oppressed, where there is an exploiter and the exploited, where there is a dominator and the dominated, where there is an attacker and the attacked. How can you be neutral in a situation like that? What we expect the whole world to do is to adopt an impartial attitude in determining the issues involved, *viz.*, whether self-determination is involved, whether an international agreement is involved, whether people are being oppressed or not. In taking an impartial attitude, they will definitely come to the correct decision which will be the support of the people of

Jammu and Kashmir. So, it is not a question of supporting Pakistan. It is not some blind romance that people either like Pakistan or India, that they support Pakistan because they like Pakistanis, that they like India because they are snake charmers. This is not the question. The question here is to determine the issue on its merits, on the rights and wrongs that are involved, and not because India is big and Pakistan is small or that Pakistan has the Khyber and India has the Taj Mahal. That is not at all involved. The question here is the question of international morality, of adjudication, of sitting as you are sitting, Mr. Speaker, and judging as to who is wrong and who is right, who has committed mistakes and who has broken promises and who has given the pledges. It is on this basis that question should be determined. If countries have come to a decision, in this regard, India should not say that these countries have gone against us.

These countries have gone in the right direction. They have supported truth and justice and they are supporting truth and justice. They are not supporting Pakistan. It so happens that Pakistan must support truth and justice because that is the ideology of Pakistan and the dictate of Islam. We support the people of Jammu and Kashmir for the redress of their greivances, not because of any territorial aggrandisement, but because Islam enjoins upon us to support the oppressed whether they be in Kashmir or elsewhere in the world. It is a dictation of our national interest. It is a dictation of our ideology. It is a dictation of our religion, and we cannot abandon any of these principles. We cannot abandon any of these positions.

Mr. Speaker, you know that the Soviet Union has offered its good offices and Pakistan has accepted the good offices of the Soviet Union. We believe that this is a positive and a constructive gesture. Soviet Union is concerned about an international dispute with regard to a territory which previously it regarded and considered to be an integral part of India. Now that it has taken this important initiative, it naturally implies that the Soviet Union recognizes this dispute not only by offering its good offices' initiative but also by the position that the Soviet Union took in the Security Council where unlike in the past it did not veto the Resolution. It supported the Resolution of September 20 and agreed to the Resolution of November 4, but abstained on an entirely different ground. These are all important and positive signs. We hope that in our efforts to impress upon the Soviet leaders that peace and goodwill can only come by settling the Jammu and Kashmir dispute. *Inshallah* we will eventually be able in the mutuality of our interests to get the powerful and mighty support on a right and just cause from the Government and the people of the Soviet Union as well.

Now, Sir, I come to Malaysia. We have been asked by a member of the

Opposition why Pakistan broke relations with Malaysia and why did it not break relations with the USSR or with India. Now, Sir, we broke relations with Malaysia not because this state supported India on the question of Jammu and Kashmir. That is not the reason. In the past there have been, as I have said, Soviet veto and support for the Indians. There have been one or two other stray countries which have supported India on the Jammu and Kashmir dispute for their own reason—Ethiopia and Yugoslavia. We have not broken relations with Ethiopia and Yugoslavia. It is not because Malaysia supported India on Jammu and Kashmir dispute that we broke relations with Malaysia. We broke relations with Malaysia because Malaysia challenged the very existence of Pakistan. Malaysia had every right to support India if they chose to do so. They could have committed all the perfidies. They could have committed all the chicaneries and supported India. That is understandable, but I would like to read out to the House some of the statements made by the Malaysian representative in the Security Council. Malaysian representative said that the Jammu and Kashmir dispute is due to the establishment of Pakistan. And then he said:

> "the Jammu and Kashmir dispute originated because Pakistan was created".

And then on the right to self-determination and the United Nations Resolutions, this representative said:

> "ancient Resolutions from the musty records of the past."

So, here is a country which challenged the very basis of the state for which Pakistanis had to wage a heroic struggle against the might of British imperialism and against the opposition of the majority community of India. Their homes were torn asunder. Refugees in millions had to sacrifice their lives, their honour for putting up a great struggle which has been one of the greatest chapters of the peoples' struggle for independence. They were ultimately able to carve out a state of a hundred million Muslims in the sub-continent after all those sacrifices. Now they should live to see it. Why should the representative of this wobbling state from which Singapore has already seceded question the very basis of Pakistan? What other honourable course had an honourable people been left with? Germany and the United States have waged war against each other. United Kingdom and Germany have waged war against each other. Soviet Union and Germany have waged war against each other. Have they ever questioned the sovereignty and the existence of each other? Then not only that; after this unparalleled and unprovoked reference to the establishment of Pakistan we gave an opportunity to the Malaysian Government. We addressed an aide memoire to the Malaysian Government and said that the representative of Malaysia had unnecessarily and without any justification challenged the very basis of the existence of Pakistan and they would please clarify the position.

We gave an opportunity to the Malaysian Government to clarify the situation. And they could have dissociated themselves from the references made by the representative of Malaysia. But, instead of that, the Malaysian Government said, "we fully support each and every word of what the Malaysian representative had said in the Security Council". Therefore, Pakistan was left with no other honourable course but to sever diplomatic relations with Malaysia and I hope the House will understand and appreciate that this was the position and these were the circumstances under which we broke diplomatic relations with Malaysia.

Now, in this respect, Mr. Speaker, some reference has been made to the work of our Ambassador. I do not think it is a right practice to mention Ambassadors' performances or their disabilities by name in the House. I think the practice in the past had been and the Leader of the Opposition will bear me out that names were not mentioned and individuals were not mentioned. In this respect if there are any complaints against any envoy or any ambassador, surely this can be made. This can be made to the Government. This could be made to me, to the Foreign Secretary, or to the President. But I would implore the House to continue the practice and the tradition which this House has maintained in the past of not mentioning either in praise or in blame the individuals. There is limitation to the work of an ambassador or an envoy. He cannot change the fundamental policies of his Government. It is not fair to expect that from an envoy or an ambassador, and in so far as this particular case is concerned, let me inform you, Sir, that I and the Foreign Office and the Government are fully satisfied with the sedulous and earnest effort Ambassador Hassan has made in Malaysia. It is not on his account, not because of him, that there had been this attitude of Malaysia. There are other considerations, such as India's influence in Malaysia, Pakistan-Indonesia relations, Indonesia-Malaysia hostilities, and a number of other factors which are beyond the scope of an envoy. I would, therefore, like to repeat that Ambassador Hassan within the limitations of policy objectives had conducted himself with exemplary zeal and skill.

Reference was made to our dissatisfaction with the September 20 Resolution and our satisfaction with the Resolution of 5th November. I believe that the Law Minister has already dilated on this matter but as the observation came from an eminent member of this House for whom I have very great respect, Shah Azizur Rahman, I would like to take some time of the House to explain the position. In so far as our attitude to the United Nations is concerned, the sense of frustration, the sense of disappointment, which we have had to experience in the last eighteen years over the Jammu and Kashmir dispute has been amply voiced. I think, I left no doubt in the minds of the United Nations and of the Security Council of our

apprehensions and our fears and frustration from the Security Council and the United Nations. On the 22nd of September in the Security Council itself I said:

"A cessation of hostilities is not enough. The Security Council, the most important organ of the United Nations must now address itself to the heart of the problem. For eighteen years it has played and toyed with the future of Kashmir. It can no longer make a plaything or toy out of five million people. It is the moral responsibility of the Security Council to address itself to a meaningful, a lasting solution of the problem of Jammu and Kashmir. The Security Council has been seized of the problem for eighteen years. There are more documents, more resolutions on Jammu and Kashmir—the most fundamental problem facing the world today—than on any other problem. Is it not ironical that with regard to a conflict that may lead to world conflagration—and the present situation has shown that it is possible for the conflict to lead to world conflagration—the Security Council has shown its lethargy, its indolence? I was here a year ago and the Security Council was not prepared to give Pakistan a piece of paper, a Resolution. It did not even want to consider the problem. It thought that it was a dead issue; that it was dormant. This can never be a dead issue; it can never be dormant. This is the last chance for the Security Council to put all its force, all its energy, all its moral responsibility behind a fair and equitable and honourable solution of Jammu and Kashmir dispute. History does not wait for Councils, organizations or institutions just as it does not wait for individuals. Ultimately we shall have to be the final determiners of our own course. Let me tell the Security Council on behalf of my Government that if now after this last chance that we are giving the Security Council, it does not put its full force, full moral responsibility and full weight behind an equitable and honourable settlement of Jammu and Kashmir dispute, Pakistan will have to leave the United Nations. I am not saying that in the form of an ultimatum. I am saying it as I am honour bound to respect the very purpose of the Charter. In leaving the United Nations, Pakistan would be fulfilling the Charter of the United Nations and then one-third or more of the world will be outside this organization and some countries which call themselves States will be members of the Security Council."

Then again in the same respect, as far as the inadequacies of the Security Council are concerned, on 25 October, at the time of the latest Resolution, I said:

"I speak this evening with a bleeding heart. I come from the battlefields of Pakistan where we have fought a monstrous and habitual aggressor and tell you, Sir, that we are prepared for the ultimate

consequences, but we shall never surrender our honour and our self-respect. The Security Council must know this. The permanent members of the United Nations must know this that Pakistan will face extinction; we shall face decimation; we shall face destruction, but we shall honour our pledge because we are an honourable people and this much you must know".

Then again to them I said: "The Security Council gave a pledge to the people of Jammu and Kashmir that they would not be placed under the sovereignty which was imposed on them by an immoral army of occupation. On 27 September the Council constituted its prestige and power to go into the heart of the problem and to secure a just and honourable settlement of the dispute. The question is: should the Council allow the other party to veto its efforts? If so, then one must be candid and say that the United Nations which we look upon as an institution of the world's conscience is now destitute of courage and drained of all its power and its moral resources. The long history of Jammu and Kashmir dispute is sufficient proof of how India's wilfulness has been encouraged by the seeming helplessness of Council. The betrayal of Ethiopia when it was pitted against Italy brought death and dishonour to the League of Nations. How can the consequent history of the United Nations betrayal of Jammu and Kashmir be any different? The betrayal of Czechoslovakia before Hitler's hordes involved the world in a disastrous war. The calcuation of power interests in the case of Jammu and Kashmir may point differently today but while these are bound to be ephemeral, the world laws are eternal and inexorable. If it were a question of obtaining any kind of peace, there would be no need for a Security Council; there would be no need for the United Nations. Why not have Hitler's peace? Why not have Chenghaiz Khan's peace? You can have peace on the terms of the victor. You can have dishonourable peace at any time. Why should there have been a San Francisco Conference at which you, Mr. President, represented Uruguay and put your signature to the charter? Was that your concept when you went as a representative of the Uruguay to the San Francisco Conference that there should be peace on any terms? Peace on any terms is always easy to achieve. Peace on any terms is something that can be achieved without war. It can be achieved on the basis of dishonour, on the basis of surrender. The United Nations came into being with its charter to achieve not peace on any terms but a just and an equitable peace."

So, we made our position quite clear to the Security Council on its inadequacies, on our sense of frustration, on our sense of disappointment. But, at the same time, on the 4th of November, when the second Resolution was passed, you must remember that it was in an entirely different context. The first resolution was passed when there was war, bloodshed and hostilities;

and they were anxious willy-nilly under any circumstances to have a resolution so that there should be a cease-fire. Then it had three parts to it: ceasefire, withdrawals, and the pledges to assist in settling the Jammu and Kashmir dispute under the cloud of war. Not only under the cloud of war but when hostilities were taking place. The Resolution of 4 November was passed in entirely different circumstances, when there was a cease-fire. The Security Council Members argued with us that "We already have a resolution; we have already committed to it." But we said, "No; there is genocide taking place in Kashmir. New developments have been taking place, for which the Security Council must meet again." It was in the teeth of India's opposition. India said that she would not attend the Council meeting; that she would have nothing to do with it. And then there were certain elements sympathetic to the Indian position, and who also did not want the Security Council meeting. So it was out of gratitude and sense of appreciation for the efforts of France, a permanent member, and other non-permanent members including Jordan, who had associated themselves with us for a resolution and for a meeting of the Security Council, that in the United Nations itself we had to express our thanks and appreciation to them for having made sedulous and tireless efforts to not only have a Council meeting in the teeth of India's opposition, supported by powerful elements, but for not succumbing to India's boycott and for proceeding with the Resolution which reaffirmed in all its parts the Resolution of September 20. It was in that limited context, and in that situation that in the United Nations, satisfaction and appreciation was expressed. But if you ask, "Are you satisfied with the situation?", then I can only quote what I said to the Security Council itself. So I hope that explains the position.

As far as the United Nations is concerned, this is a grave issue. It is not that for the first time the United Nations has told us, "Lay down your arms. We will assist in bringing about a settlement." Eighteen years ago the United Nations told the people of Pakistan, "Lay down your arms; have a ceasefire; and we will give you a settlement—an honourable and just settlement". There were also two Resolutions of August 1948 and January 1949, committing the whole power and prestige of the United Nations and the Security Council members, including the great powers, to an honourable and just settlement of the Kashmir dispute.

Now, Sir, what happened in these eighteen years? So much so that, when in 1963 and 1964 I went back, some of the members said to me that this is a dead issue; that this is a dead horse you are flogging; and one representative of a great power said, "Please do not bring internal questions to the forum of the United Nations. Do not exploit the United Nations for internal consumption." And to that extent, Sir, they were not

prepared even to have a resolution. That was the position. And now, again, the people of Pakistan had to make the ultimate sacrifices to launch a heroic struggle. The United Nations, being wise by its experience, should have this time interposed itself with threats of its sanctions to stop the fighting and bring about a settlement. Surely the United Nations should be wiser by its experience. If it feels that the problem is so complicated and so difficult, then it should not intervene again, and say that. Although we know that it is a difficult problem and a complicated problem, none-the-less this time we are determined to settle it. Is the United Nations so powerful that it can tell Pakistan, "Stop!"; that it can tell Pakistan that all the lives that have been shed be in vain, and at the same time so powerless, so powerless as not to be able to tell India that she must honour her commitment? This is a juxtaposition. This is a question of double standards. Either the United Nations apply the same standards for India and Pakistan, or it must say that the greatest betrayal has been committed against the people of Pakistan for the second time in less than two decades. So, after all, we have a right to reappraise our whole attitude towards the United Nations in the circumstances, if the United Nations fails to fulfil its own commitments, honour its own Charter. What does the Charter of the United Nations say? The Charter of the United Nations, in clear terms, in its own Preamble and in Article 1, has this to say. The Preamble says:

"WE THE PEOPLES OF THE UNITED NATIONS DETERMINED

to save succeeding generations from the scourage of war, which twice in our lifetime has brought untold sorrow to mankind, and

to reaffirm faith in fundamental human rights, in the dignity and worth of the human person, in the equal rights of men and women and of nations, large and small, and

to establish conditions under which justice and respect for the obligations arising from treaties and other sources of international law can be maintained, and to promote social progress and better standards of life in larger freedom,

AND FOR THESE ENDS

to practise tolerance and live together in peace with one another as good neighbours, and

to unite our strength to maintain international peace and security".

Then in Article 1 it says:

"The Purposes of the United Nations are:

1. To maintain international peace and security, and to that end: to take effective collective measures for the prevention and removal of threats to the peace, and for the suppression of acts of aggression

or other breaches of the peace, and to bring about by peaceful means, and in conformity with the principles of justice and international law, adjustment or settlement of international disputes or situations which might lead to a breach of the peace;

2. To develop friendly relations among nations based on respect for the principle of equal rights and self-determination of peoples, and to take other appropriate measures to strengthen universal peace".

So, the Preamble talks about saving the scourage of war, which twice in our life has brought untold sorrow to mankind; and Article 1 commits its own Charter to promote international security and to settle international disputes which are a threat to peace. Is it not right for us to question the effectiveness or the power of the United Nations, if again a war is waged on the people of Pakistan. I think the time has come when the United Nations must take a courageous and right position in respect of countries which do not honour its own resolutions. We have got South Africa which has defied the United Nations resolutions; we have got Israel which has defeated the United Nations resolution; and we have India that has defied the United Nations resolutions. The first moral obligation is to expel those countries in the future from the United Nations Organization which do not implement the United Nations resolutions. We are with the people of Africa to support the expulsion of South Africa from the United Nations; we are with all the people of Arab world for the expulsion of Israel from the United Nations; and we hope that the whole of Arabia, the whole of Asian and African world, and the whole of Latin America will be with us in our demand for the expulsion of India from the United Nations because there is no difference in the resolutions of the United Nations between Israel, South Africa and India. The United Nations should now ceaselessly struggle for the expulsion of those monstrous states who have dishonoured the charter of the United Nations and have committed aggression and flouted international law and morality. These are the grave issues which the people of Pakistan will have to decide and determine; these are issues which will have to go to the people of Pakistan for their determination; it is not for certain persons to say that we should not reappraise our attitude to the United Nations in spite of its betrayal. It is not for the members of the Opposition to tell us that we should not reappraise our attitude; it is not for any of our colleagues to say that we should not reappraise our attitude to the United Nations; it is for the people who will have ultimately to decide what attitude they must take with the United Nations.

Now, Sir, as far as the struggle for Jammu and Kashmir is concerned, as I have already said, whatever may be India's strength, her battalions,

her division, her atom bomb, her support in the world, we cannot abandon the people of Jammu and Kashmir. India should know this, the whole world should know this. Let it be said in a spirit of solemnity, with all calmness and calculation at our command, that we cannot abandon the people of Jammu and Kashmir irrespective of the consequences. Why do I say that? I say that because international law is involved; international morality is involved; faith is involved; race is involved; religion is involved; geography is involved; and, above all, justice is involved. If we are to surrender the people of Jammu and Kashmir, we will be surrendering Pakistan. The surrender of the people of Jammu and Kashmir is like the surrender of Dacca, or Lahore, or Chittagong, or Karachi. They are a part of us, indivisible, indistinguishable, inseparable part of us, and they shall remain a part of us all the time irrespective of the temporary expediencies and the temporary situation. The redemption of the people of Jammu and Kashmir is not an obsession with us; it is our moral and religious obligation. Individuals may come and go; Governments may come and go; but we cannot abandon the people of Jammu and Kashmir. There is no question here of anything emotional or subjective being involved. This is a problem which goes to the heart of the very basis of Pakistan; to the struggle for Pakistan and to the culmination of Pakistan as a great and glorious state. Hundred million people of Pakistan, men, women and children, are prepared to stand united like steel not merely because sentiment is involved. This history of the last September and October events shows that it is not a question of obsession here. Every Pakistani felt its heart throb. It is a manifestation of the most glorious aspects of human beings to make a struggle, in spite of the consequences, for their brothers, for the right of the people to free themselves and liberate themselves from the oppression of foreign yoke; and, Sir, that is why unfortunately there has to be confrontation with India. We do not want confrontation. We seek peace; all people seek peace and we, in particular, to remove the burden of poverty from our shoulders. We want to wipe out misery and want and disease. We want to give a better and honourable life to our people. We seek peace more than the opulent states. We know the meaning of peace, but at the same time there has to be confrontation with India because India holds us in bondage in Jammu and Kashmir and unless and until we break that bondage there will never be real peace, real progress, real betterment, because if our economic condition improves, even if we have a better life and better lot, yet our conscience will be in pain because with opulence and prosperity we will see oppression in Jammu and Kashmir. Will that be any satisfaction to us? Will the night-mares come to an end. Will we be able to sleep with a clear and clean conscience knowing that we have a more materially better life, when our people in Jammu and Kashmir are

getting oppressed more and more and for ever and ever darkness grows by the day and that their children are slaughtered, their women dishonoured and oppression has become complete. Therefore, there has to be a confrontation until we achieve our victory. We cannot have *mushaira* one day and murder the next day; we cannot say let there be goodwill between India and Pakistan and by goodwill the situation will improve. We had goodwill before, from 1958 to 1961, and what had happened? India said, "not do disturb the goodwill by discussing Kashmir." So, we know the experience of the past; we know the fraud of goodwill. How can you decieve the people of Pakistan? So, confrontation must remain till the problem of Jammu and Kashmir is settled. The people of Pakistan must know the situation. The Bible says: Blessed are the peace-makers; and we want peace. We want to put an end to confrontation; we want a perpetual peace with India. Geography is there which cannot be denied the realities of the situation. But India must also accept the realities of the situation; it is not only that Pakistan should accept the realities of the situation. India must accept and face the realities of the situation and that cannot be done by saying that Kashmir is an integral part of India. They must face the reality; they must know what the world knows and they must settle it. They will relieve the burden from the shoulders of their people who are starving. Why should they take the additional liability of the five million people of Jammu and Kashmir. Indians are spending crores in holding Kashmir in subjugation. The British abandoned their colonies when the British empire became weak. Now that India is weak, they should abandon Jammu and Kashmir. If they abandon Jammu and Kashmir, it will be better for them. And, finally, Sir, let there be no doubt after a long long and profitable debate in which I again pay tributes to the sense of patriotism of the leaders and the members of the Opposition that they have shown and thereby demonstrated the indivisible unity of the people of Pakistan. Finally, if after this there is any doubt or any misgiving about the situation or how it has been faced, as I would say, in that event, let there be a people's court; let the people of Sialkot, the people of Lahore, the people of Dacca, the people of Hyderabad and the people of Peshawar, our people of the cities and those who have suffered most, decide; and if they want our heads, we will give them our heads.

Speech in the National Assembly on March 14, 1966

Pakistan's Foreign Policy—Visits Abroad—Relations with India—Creation and Ideology of Pakistan—Martyrs—National Aims and Ideals—Kashmir Dispute—Arms Race—Lesson—International Role and Responsibility of Pakistan—Relations with Other Countries—Tashkent Declaration

Mr. Speaker, Sir, the Assembly held a debate on foreign policy in November last, less than four months ago. During this interval many important developments have taken place. Some of them, such as the President's visit to the United States to address the United Nations General Assembly and meet President Johnson, my own visits to the Soviet Union, Rumania, Czechoslovakia and Iran, and the Tashkent Declaration leading to the recent meeting at Rawalpindi between the Ministers of Pakistan and India, have been discussed at length in the country with regard to their meanings and implications. These discussions have revealed some misgivings about the direction of our foreign policy; even the principles governing it have been questioned. The Government therefore welcomes this opportunity to review and discuss the country's foreign policy, so that controversies may be removed through constructive and fruitful exchange of views and ideas among the representatives of this nation. Thus could be reached a consensus of opinion, and a sense of purpose be defined more closely.

So far as our relations with India are concerned, it is clear that after eighteen years of ill-will and hostility still one more attempt is being made to reach a peaceful and honourable settlement of all disputes between the two nations so that their six hundred million people may apply their energies and attention to the task of social and economic development. The history of the last 18 years shows that Pakistan has not been found wanting in efforts to reach an honourable understanding with its neighbours. If the sad experience of these years has chastened our hopes, we should nevertheless proceed not with skepticism but with certainty and determina-

tion, not with bitterness but with amity, not with cynicism and delusions but with patience and realism.

This nation was born in blood. The story of that struggle added a glorious chapter to the history of the struggle of peoples everywhere for liberation; for Pakistan was born of a progressive idea—the idea of self-determination *i.e.*, the right of peoples to live their lives in freedom, to develop themselves in accordance with their genius, cultural background and historic destination.

(*Interruptions*)

Ever since its birth, Pakistan has had to contend with bitter hostility aimed at its very existence. I need not recall the history of the days and years that followed Independence, the perfidies we had to put up with, the calumnies we had to refute. Crisis upon crisis followed during Pakistan's nascent years. But this nation overcome all difficulties. United, we met every challenge thrown at us. The determination of the people to maintain the independence, solidarity and integrity of the country emerged the stronger and firmer from every ordeal.

This nations' single-minded resolve and sense of purpose were demonstrated, as never before, during the recent war. The firmness of its faith and the depth of its determination, were proved by the blood of martyrs on the battle field. Their sacrifice is an answer to those who believe that they can destroy the unity and resolve of Pakistan. As a people and as a nation we demonstrated, to friend and foe alike, that Pakistan was not the amputed limb of another body-politic but the expression of the will and determination of its 100 million people to live with honour in freedom and unity.

It is against this background that we must look at our national aims and ideals, and examine the policies pursued for their achievement. It is important to look beyond the immediate experience and to view the picture as a whole. The broad objectives of Pakistan's policy since the beginning have been and continue to be:

i) To complete, consolidate and defend the sovereign independence and integrity of the nation;
ii) To carry forward the economic and social development of the country as rapidly as possible in order to transform our society, raise the living standards of our people and to bring to the country all the benefits and enlightenment which modern knowledge and technology can provide;
iii) To play a role in the world commensurate with our size and situation and especially to contribute towards establishing a world order based on freedom and equality of all nations and peoples.

The unresolved dispute over the state of Kashmir is a continuation of

the struggle through which Pakistan itself was created. Although we have claimed that the state of Kashmir should become a part of Pakistan for geographical, economic, strategic, cultural and religious considerations—it is plain that the natural affinity of this State and its people lies with Pakistan on all or any of these grounds—yet we have upheld the principle that the people of the state of Kashmir should be given the free choice of deciding whether they wish to join the Muslim homeland on the sub-continent. In fact this choice was exercised by every constituent unit of Pakistan. It was through the voluntary act and declaration of their representatives that the people of West Punjab, Sind, East Bengal and Baluchistan chose to live in Pakistan. It was by means of direct referenda that the people of the North West Frontier Province and Sylhet joined this nation. Until the people of Kashmir are able to exercise this right of self-determination, a right solemnly promised to them, the task of establishing peace between the two nations of the sub-continent would remain unfinished.

The refusal to accept this fact is a refusal to recognize the inevitable and natural culmination of a thousand years of history. If behind the stubborn refusal to accept realities, the systematic flouting of commitments and the deliberate dishonouring of pledges, there lurks the hope of undoing history, then only conflict and misery lie ahead for both countries and peoples.

It is because such designs are, in fact, entertained by many people across the border that Pakistan has expressed concern and misgivings about the militarization of the sub-continent. We continue to feel that an arms race, for whatever reason, between India and Pakistan, will bring disaster upon both and suffering to their peoples.

There is one lesson which we must draw from recent events and which we would ignore at our peril. It is that our independence would not be real, our integrity would not be safe and our interests would not be protected if we entrust them into the hands of others. It has been, from the beginning, the aim of Pakistan's policy to foster goodwill towards all nations. It would therefore be the negation of this policy also to make the country's viability, defence and diplomacy dependent upon the goodwill of any particular country or group of countries. It is clear, of course, that Pakistan is not, and will not be for some considerable time, self sufficient in resources for her development and defence. Yet our endeavour must be to reduce progressively our dependence on external assistance and pursue consciously and systematically the noble objective of self reliance. We must increase in every way our own capacity to finance economic development as well as national defence. We should diversify foreign markets for our exports, and diversify the external sources of the capital and

equipment we need, and take steps to mobilize more effectively our human and national resources.

The question, however, is a larger one than that of meeting the immediate needs of capital and equipment. It involves consideration of what is Pakistan's place in the world. The size, population and geo-political situation of Pakistan, and the faith and ideology of its people, have thrust upon it a certain role and responsibility. Pakistan is today in the main stream of world politics. Events that happen in far away countries are capable of affecting our interests. We are frequently called upon to take a position on or react to events that occur on the world stage.

Sir, in one way or another we have a direct relationship with all the great powers. Bonds of brotherhood and cultural affinity bind us with the great Muslim world which spreads from the Pacific to the Atlantic. We have also developed sympathy and common aspiration with the third world of Africa and Asia and other under-developed countries, many of whom, like us, have struggled against colonial domination and are now engaged in the task of finding their places and developing their potentialities.

It is against this moving and constantly changing backdrop that the foreign policy of Pakistan has to be conceived, formulated and carried out. Our own immediate problem, the problem of living peacefully with our neighbour India, which is a difficult one in itself—the difficulties can be seen in concrete form in the dispute over the state of Kashmir, over the eviction of Muslims from West Bengal, Assam and Tripura, over the use of eastern rivers and other problems—is made more complex by the clash of ideologies and interests amongst the great powers, which casts its shadow on the sub-continent.

There was a time perhaps when the choice may have seemed simple and the course before us clear. Today we must proceed with circumspection, guided by confidence in the righteousness of our cause. It is necessary for a progressive foreign policy that our relations with other countries, great or small, near or far, be shorn of the myths and confusion that have clouded them in the past. We therefore seek friendship of all countries honestly and without mental reservation. We have no desire to engage in the game of power politics. Our allegiance is not on auction to the highest bidder, nor do we intend to play off one friend against another in a search for diplomatic leverage.

It has been stated by the President also in his address to the National Assembly last week: The direction of our policy 'is determined by mutual interests and common understanding. We do not use or exploit differences between other countries nor do we allow these differences to govern our thinking or attitude towards them.' This is why Pakistan can maintain

friendly relations with all the great powers.

Over the years a relationship of friendship and understanding grew between this country and the United States, a relationship which we in Pakistan, for our part, have valued and continue to value. We are thankful to the United States for the generous assistance they have given to us and for their continued interest in our economic development. We are also appreciative of the merits of cooperation between the developed countries of the world and those countries which, for historical and other reasons, have remained poor and under-developed. Such cooperation based on enlightened self-interest is mutually benficial.

The House is aware of the concern felt in this country when, after the border clash of October 1962 between India and the People's Republic of China, the Western Powers, in particular the United States, decided to give the fullest assistance to India's plan for a massive augmentation of its Armed Forces. I do not consider that it would be fruitful, at this stage, to recapitulate the controversy over this matter with the United States. It has been proved that our fears were not imaginary. We hope that the events of the last year have brought about a better appreciation of the realities of the situation. It is no secret that our growing relations with the United States have passed through a period of strain in the last few years. I am glad to say that as a result of the President's visit to the United States and his discussion with President Johnson, there is a better understanding of Pakistan's aims and objectives and of its policy of fostering relations with all its neighbours. Contrary to the unfortunate impression created by the Press Release issued by the United States Information Service at the conclusion of the recent visit to the sub-continent by U.S. Vice-President Humphrey, his visit to Pakistan confirmed that the continuing relationship between Pakistan and the United States could be maintained on an honourable and mutually advantageous basis. The USIS report, as Members are aware, was categorically disowned by Mr. Humphrey himself.

With our great neighbour, the People's Republic of China, our relations continue to grow, as the President stated before the House the other day. The people of Pakistan shall not forget the support and help which the people and Government of that country extended to us in the recent conflict. It is my pleasant duty to announce that in response to an invitation extended to him, President Liu Shao Chi will pay a visit to this country at the end of this month on a tour of West Pakistan. The visit of President Liu Shao Chi to East Pakistan will take place subsequently in the month of April. It is our hope that the forthcoming visit will further strengthen the bonds between our two countries and contribute to strengthening of the fabric of peace in this region and in the world.

The House is also aware that, at the invitation of His Majesty King

Zahir Shah, the President paid a three-day visit to Kabul from 1st to 3rd January. As a result of the meeting between the two Heads of State the foundation has been laid for ever-growing cooperation between the two States in many fields. The Government of Pakistan are ready, as they have been in the past, to seek constructive avenues for peaceful cooperation between Pakistan and Afghanistan for the mutual benefit of both peoples.

The meeting of the Ministerial Council of R.C.D. held at Islamabad in February afforded us the pleasure of welcoming to this country the Foreign Ministers of Iran and Turkey. We took this opportunity to express to the representatives of these two brother countries all the gratitude and emotion we feel at the support and help they rendered to us in our moment of need. The bonds among our countries are of an abiding nature. Our effort to give them concrete shape through Regional Cooperation for Development among our countries has progressed so rapidly and so satisfactorily that it is difficult to realize that the idea is not much more than a year old.

An arrangement somewhat similar to the RCD and known as the Indonesia-Pakistan Economic and Cultural Cooperation Organisation (IPECC) was established with the object of fostering and developing trade, economic and cultural relations between the two countries. Our combined population of 220 million and their resources and skills make for an economic collaboration of vast potentiality and significance. However, Pakistan's relations with Indonesia transcend considerations of an economic or diplomatic nature. The bonds of brotherhood between our peoples were forged when, in the Indonesia's struggle against imperialism, the people of Pakistan stood beside their Indonesian brethren and many fought shoulder to shoulder with them. These links have been strengthened by the unstinting and unhesitating support given to us in the recent war by the people and Government of Indonesia, under their great leader President Ahmed Soekarno. It was a support for our fight for right and justice. Such strong ties cannot be shaken loose by the vicissitude of events or effaced by political changes and shifts.

This is not all. With our great and powerful neighbour to the north, the USSR, Pakistan's bilateral relations have been growing in all fields. Recently a trade agreement was signed and soon, we expect, goods and traffic between the two countries would begin to flow along the new road which links the Khyber Pass with the Oxus river, passing through Afghanistan. This new and constructive development will prove beneficial to all the three countries and open a new and positive chapter in their relations with one another.

In our relations with the USSR one significant and important development is its direct participation in the efforts to secure a peaceful settlement

of disputes between Pakistan and India. It was the initiative of Premier Kosygin which led to the meeting of President Ayub and the late Prime Minister Shastri at Tashkent. The Tashkent Declaration has been the subject of a great deal of comment at home and abroad. There has been some misunderstanding of its implications and consequences. In a number of statements the President, other spokesmen of the Government and I myself have explained the purport of the declaration and what it seeks to achieve. I need not go over this ground again.

It is, however, worth repeating that the Tashkent Declaration contains no specific answers to our difficulties with India, nor does it suggest specific solutions to our disputes and differences with that country. Unlike the Charter of the United Nations, with its comprehensive and binding legal obligations and procedures, this joint declaration of Pakistan and India represents only one of the possible methods envisaged in the Charter for settling disputes. The Tashkent Declaration forecloses no possibilities, blocks no avenues to the achievement of our legitimate aims and the vindication of our just rights. It is a door and not a barrier. It is not a contract but a document of intent. The immediate objective of the Declaration was to remove and undo, in so far as it is possible to do so, the damage and debris of war. Its significance lies in the fact that it provides a framework and machinery for a renewed effort to seek a solution of disputes between Pakistan and India. The future will show whether a new beginning is to be made in this direction.

The conference held early this month between Ministers of the two countries is only a first step in the process which may be a long one, a process of consultation, discussion and negotiations to settle outstanding disputes, to remove the cause of war and to ensure, for the future, that both countries eschew the intention as well as the ability to make war upon each other.

At the heart of the matter lies the question: Can the two nations of the sub-continent live in peace with each other? In this regard the unresolved dispute over the state of Kashmir remains the most fundamental obstacle to peace between Pakistan and India. However, there are other issues and disputes also between the two countries, the settlement of which is no less important for the establishment of peaceful and friendly relations between the two countries. The eviction of Indian Muslims from West Bengal, Assam, Tripura and Rajasthan—I might remind the House that more than half a million of them are living in camps in East Pakistan—has brought hardship and suffering upon the affected people causing tension and exacerbation of relations between the two nations. There is also the danger to the economy of a number of districts of East Pakistan from the barrage India proposes to construct on the Ganges at Ferraka. The inevitable

adverse effects of this barrage on agriculture in East Pakistan were explained in the House the other day. This question is a part of the larger issue concerning equitable and mutually-beneficial utilization of the rivers common to both countries. We have given much thought to this problem and it is our conviction that the water resources of the eastern rivers can be exploited in such a manner as to bring great benefit to both countries instead of damaging the interests of either.

There is in fact no problem between Pakistan and India which cannot be solved on a basis of justice and honour. In the past, many difficult and dangerous disputes have been settled because both States adopted a positive and constructive approach. For instance in April last year, when a clash took place between their armed forces on account of the long standing dispute over the Rann of Kutch, both agreed to the course of submitting the dispute to international arbitration.

Nothing is lacking for reaching similar settlements on all our outstanding disputes and differences except the will and desire of both countries to make a sincere effort to settle them. This is true not only for disputes over evictions and Farraka Barrage but also about the basic dispute of Kashmir over which we have gone to war twice in the last 18 years.

We have been encouraged, in the recent talks held with the Indian leaders at Rawalpindi, by their recognition of the necessity to settle and resolve this continuing cause of conflict. Both countries have agreed to meet again and it is our hope that the dialogue which has now opened between our two countries would continue in a meaningful and sincere manner, so that the settlement which brought about the emergence of India and Pakistan as two independent nations can be consummated.

In opening this debate on Foreign Policy, I would like to re-emphasize that the Government welcomes this opportunity for a discussion of issues of the utmost importance to this nation. It is a foremost consideration of any policy that it must reflect a consensus of thinking within the country and project the aims and aspirations of its people. Foreign Policy above all is a subject on which deliberation must be on the basis of national interests and the will of the people.

The cardinal need is for the greatest measure of national unity. Our deliberations today will have a profound bearing on the destiny of the nation and the welfare of our people. Let us, therefore, in discharging our responsibility proceed with sincerity and courage of conviction.

Speech in the National Assembly on March 16, 1966

Foreign Affairs—Pakistan a God-made Country—Indo-Pakistan War—Moral and Immoral Wars—World Support for Kashmiris and Pakistan—India Isolated—India an Aggressor—Just Struggle—Interest of East Pakistan—Kashmir a Disputed Territory—Existence of Pakistan at Stake—Pakistan Victorious—What War Means—Why East Pakistan Not Attacked—Tashkent Declaration—Soviet Initiative—Relations with the United States and China—Importance of Pakistan's Struggle for Kashmir.

Mr. Speaker, Sir, I have heard the debate with great interest, because it is of crucial importance to Pakistan and its future. The views of the Opposition have been taken into account and I will make an endeavour in formulating the Government's policies to take into account the various issues that have been raised by the Opposition.

One of the eminent speakers from the Opposition, Shah Azizur Rahman, in his statement has said that foreign affairs emanate and originate from internal conditions. This was reiterated by a number of members of the Opposition when they said that there is a direct co-relation between the internal and external relations of a sovereign State. This is a truism and I would like to say that we agree with the members of the Opposition when they say that foreign affairs and internal affairs are inter-connected and that foreign affairs in many ways stem out of internal considerations.

As much as internal considerations affect foreign policy, foreign policy of a country also affects its internal affairs. They both have a relationship of cause and effect. But in order to ascertain what are those relations, what are the motivating factors which bring about an inter-relationship between the foreign affairs and the internal affairs in our own country, it is necessary for us to know what is Pakistan itself. What is our State and what is our status? What are our objectives? What are our motivations?

Pakistan is a great ideal. A member of this House has said that Pakistan was a man-made country. Pakistan is not just a man-made country. It is a God-made country. It is a progressive idea. It is a concrete idea. It is a beautiful thought. It is a creation of excellence. That is what is Pakistan—a

beautiful idea, a concrete thought and a creation of excellence. It is not just the sandy desert of Sind or the rugged nobility of Baluchistan and the enchanting lushness of Bengal or the inspiring plains of the Punjab or the raw courage of the land of the Pathans, and it is not just the land of a 100 million valiant and heroic people. Indeed all these things—the desert of Sind, the lushness of Bengal, the magnificent plains of the Punjab, the raw courage of the North-Western Frontier and the nobility of Baluchistan, go to make Pakistan. On top of all these there is something much more to Pakistan. It is the blessing of Allah. Pakistan is the creation of the surge of Islamic nationhood. Pakistan is the product of an earth-shaking idea. It is a revolution cut out of the heart of history. Pakistan is the struggle of mankind for liberty and equality, much more inspired and much more romantic than the original revolution of man. Pakistan is a live revolution. In order to understand the internal and external policy of Pakistan, you must understand what Pakistan is and what are the motivations which created Pakistan. It is a revolution against repression. It is the handsomest off-spring of self-determination. That is what Pakistan is. That is why Pakistan is not only a physical reality but it has a romantic ideological basis on the teachings of Iqbal as they were translated into actuality by the Quaid-e-Azam.

The French Revolution was inspired by the struggle of mankind against oppression. The Pakistan revolution has inspired the people everywhere throughout the world in their struggle for self-determination. Pakistan is the culmination of an ideology and the incarnation of self-determination. Pakistan is a beautiful thing. There is nothing ugly about Pakistan. Pakistan is a great and glorious culmination of the people's struggle for emancipation. Pakistan is the product of concrete forces which cannot be mutilated. Pakistan can never be recast, can never be reshaped. Pakistan is never to be amputed or merged. "It is the mercy of God on earth ", as the great German Philosopher Hegel said.

I, as the Foreign Minister of Pakistan would say that I would not exchange one Masud, or one Yusufzai or one Chandio for all the industrial power of India. I would not be prepared to barter one millimetre of the sacred soil of Pakistan for all the industrial arsenal of India.

Pakistan is a mystical idea. It is an idea which we well understand and which only the Pakistanis can best understand. Those who have struggled for the creation of Pakistan, those who know what self-determination really means, will understand what is its motivation. To the foreigners sometimes Pakistan is an enigma. Others say that it is a miracle but miracle is a norm to the Pakistanis. Pakistan is the heart-throb of the people. Pakistan is the culmination of the aspirations of the Islamic Order. Those who were fortunate enough to join the struggle for Pakistan like Shah

Azizur Rahman, Mr. Sabur and others, those who were in the forefront of the struggle, to them I should say that glory belongs to you, because you have contributed to one of the richest chapters of the history of mankind. And to those of us who have to defend and consolidate the integrity of Pakistan I say the challenge is an enchanting one and we shall accept it with confidence.

I now come to the war. So much has been said about it. Members in this House have said, "Why this war?" They have accused the Government of irresponsible action. Some of them even assumed that the initiative for war lay with us.

War is a terrible thing. It has rarely been consciously sought as it is a vehicle of destruction and yet from the dawn of history there have been terrible wars of destruction. Civilizations half as old as time have been destroyed, magnificent cities like London, Stalingrad and Berlin have been devastated to the point of nothingness. In the ultimate analysis it will be found that mankind fared better when they fought on the basis of justice and a more complete dignity and morality. History knows of two wars: one is the immoral war of avarice and exploitation and the other is a war of resistance against domination and exploitation. These are the two categories in which modern man will place wars: one of avarice and exploitation and the other a struggle for emancipation and liberty.

Alexander the Great, sought to conquer the world, but the world of his time disillusioned him. Why was he disillusioned? Because his was a war of avarice and exploitation. The Roman legions swept across Europe, Asia and Africa but they were driven back from everywhere because theirs was a war of exploitation and avarice. Charlemagne, the Great, held sway over Europe but the people of Europe destroyed his empire because his was a war of conquest and avarice. Chengiz Khan's hordes gallopped across Asia and parts of Europe but the Khan's conquest had to be halted and defeated because the great Khan's war was of avarice. Napoleon dreamt of conquering the world but he was driven from Moscow because his war was a war of exploitation. Hitler dreamt like Napoleon but like Napoleon he too was driven back from Moscow because his war was of domination and exploitation. From Alexander to Hitler, from the colonialist wars of the British and the French, all wars of exploitation and avarice have been decisively defeated by people struggling for emancipation, independence and self-respect.

The other war is a glorious war, it is a war of liberation, it is a war of national self-assertion. Small powers have stood against mighty empires, little people have had to fight for their freedom and they have succeeded because theirs have been wars which have been called just wars. There is a distinction between war of exploitation and just war. Just war cannot fail.

no matter how serious the consequences, no matter how great is the empire that is pitted against it. We have to draw a distinction—a clear and precise distinction between war of exploitation and struggle for independence against exploitation.

In what category does the struggle of the people of Jammu and Kashmir fall? Is the struggle of the people of Jammu and Kashmir a war of exploitation and war of domination or is their struggle for freedom a war for self-respect, for independence, for self-assertion and for self-dignity? This is the basic distinction that has to be drawn in pronouncing a judgement on the subject matter of war. But is it fair for the Foreign Minister of Pakistan to pronounce whether we fought a war of exploitation or whether we fought a just war? Is it fair for the Foreign Minister to say whether the people of Jammu and Kashmir struggled for their independence and liberty against oppression or whether they were exploiters akin to Napoleon or Chengiz Khan or Alexandar the Great? I do not think it is necessary for me to answer the question because perhaps you may say that this is a subjective evaluation of history. I would urge the House to take into account what the rest of the world say on the subject matter of this war.

The whole world supported the people of Jammu and Kashmir during the September war. Have you ever asked yourself, honourable members, why is it that the international community supported Pakistan in the September war as against India? The whole people and all the Governments of Asia, Africa, Latin America and Europe supported Pakistan. They supported Pakistan because the struggle of the people of Jammu and Kashmir was a just struggle. It was a process in the culmination of self-respect of the international community, not because they had any preferential treatment for Pakistan as against India but because objectively they believed that the people of Jammu and Kashmir were struggling against foreign domination. There was no difference between their struggle and the struggle of the people of Algeria, the people of Southern Rhodesia, Asia and Africa and people throughout the world who fought for liberation. This is why the whole world supported the people of Jammu and Kashmir. The world of Islam perhaps, for the first time in its history of 1300 years, was united right from the Maghrib to the Pacific, right from Algeria to Indonesia in support of Pakistan and in support of the people of Jammu and Kashmir because that was a just struggle. Right from Algeria to Indonesia they supported the people of Jammu and Kashmir and Pakistan for their just struggle, because ours was a struggle for the cause not only of the people of Jammu and Kashmir but because our fight and our struggle was for a better world order, for a finer society, for greater justice and articulation of right against wrong and that is why 5 million

people of Jammu and Kashmir and the people of Pakistan were supported by the Afro-Asian countries, by the world of Islam. They were supported everywhere because they stood valiantly and courageously for a right cause.

India, in size and in territory, in resources and in diplomatic ingenuity, is a great country. India is like Europe, the whole of Europe without Russia. The size of India and the resources of India are like Europe without Russia and yet it stood alone. It stood completely alone and forsaken. India was absolutely isolated with all its resources, with all its power, with all its diplomatic agility, going back to Asoka—no not Asoka, Asoka was a Pakistani, make no mistake about it—going back to all their ancient rulers. So they stood absolutely alone, forsaken and naked in this struggle and the late Lal Bahadur Shastri in the height of the war had to say that India is all alone; India is not supported by any country in the world. These are not my remarks: these are remarks of Lal Bahadur Shastri, Prime Minister of India, who said at the height of the conflict that we stand all alone. India—Europe without Russia—standing against the Denmark of Europe. Why? Because justice was with us, because we were espousing a righteous cause, because we were supporting the right of self-determination, the most noble ideal known to modern man. That is why India with all its resources, with all its might, with all the formidable and invincible armada of its power and strength stood absolutely isolated and alone. And the Prime Minister of India had to say that we stand alone and deserted and Pakistan has the support of the world. This is a phenomenon which is unknown to history. Never before in the history of mankind has such a situation arisen. And that is because we were supporting a right cause and we were fulfilling our commitments and our pledge to the people of Jammu and Kashmir.

That India was the aggressor is borne out by statements made by many of the members of the Security Council. If the members of the Opposition would care to look at the statements in the Security Council and its proceedings they will see that many States said that India is the aggressor. That India was the aggressor was borne out by the September 6th resolution of the Security Council. That India was the aggressor was borne out by the statement of Prime Minister Harold Wilson. Great Britain is no particular friend of Pakistan. Both India and Pakistan are members of the Commonwealth and the Anglo-Saxons weigh the scales of justice evenly between their fellow-Commonwealth members and yet with all due respect, and I must say that Prime Minister Harold Wilson was brave enough to declare that India had committed aggression against Pakistan. We admire him for standing by truth.

And then, Mr. Krishna Menon went to Cairo to plead India's case and

what was Mr. Krishna Menon told in Cairo? Mr. Krishna Menon was told in Cairo that India crossed the international frontier and that Cairo could not support India in spite of all the association and friendship that existed between Cairo and New Delhi. That India was the aggressor was borne out by all the statements that were made by the leaders of Asia and Africa. Latin America and Europe during the Indo-Pakistan war.

It must be clearly understood that Pakistan did not start this war. We had every moral and legitimate reason and justification to support the people of Jammu and Kashmir in their legitimate right for self-determination. We are ourselves the product of self-determination and we had every right to support the people of Jammu and Kashmir for their self-determination as much as we had supported the people of Algeria for their self-determination. In the case of Jammu and Kashmir we had even greater reason to support the right of the people of Jammu and Kashmir for self-determination.

It must be clearly understood, that in supporting the people of Jammu and Kashmir for self-determination we did not commit aggression against India. This is a factor which must be clearly understood in order to remove confusion and inconsistency in the minds of some people that if Pakistan supports the people of Jammu and Kashmir for their right of self-determination as the rest of the world has supported the people of Jammu and Kashmir in their fight for self-determination then we are not committing any aggression against India. If the rest of the world, if China, Indonesia, Algeria, Morocco—and I do not want to quote all the other countries—support the struggle of the people of Jammu and Kashmir for self-determination, then they also committed aggression against India if we committed aggression against India. A clear and basic distinction must be drawn in order to appreciate and understand the realities of the present situation.

We had been told that we plunged our country into war, that we risked the future of Pakistan by supporting the people of Jammu and Kashmir for self-determination. I have already explained that in supporting the people of Jammu and Kashmir we are not violating any norm of international law or international morality. We support *bellum justum*, a just war of the people for their liberation. In spite of that, many patriotic friends of ours have said our defences were bad and we took a terrible risk. It was possibly an adventurism and there was an element of immaturity in it. This is not so. It must be appreciated and understood that this was a heroic struggle. This was a heroic support for a great and noble cause. This is one of the factors which makes Pakistan great and which will make Pakistan a pioneer and a piller of strength and morality for the whole of Asia and Africa.

Let us look at history. If the whole world can be plunged into the war of 1914 for the assassination of an Archduke whose name, I believe, very

few people in this House and even in the galleries will remember should we not be committed to the five million people of Jammu and Kashmir and support them in their struggle for independence? In 1939 Britain and France declared war against Germany, because there was a commitment on the part of Britain and France to support the international frontiers of Poland and in order to fulfil their commitment Britain and France plunged the whole world into war and the international community was faced with obliteration because Britain and France had to honour their commitment to Poland and millions of people had to die because the commitment had to be honoured. A commitment had to be honoured in order to respect treaty obligations and that is why Britain and France are great powers because they fulfilled their commitment to the people of Poland. If they could fulfil their commitments in spite of its terrible consequences, should not Pakistan fulfil its commitment to the people of Jammu and Kashmir?

Let us come closer to our times. United States of America is a great and prosperous country. It has much more to lose by war than any other country. If we are at war, some Dawood Mills may be destroyed, some Adamjee Mills may be destroyed. But if United States is at war that means destruction of a saturated society, yet the United States have the courage and the honour to tell the Soviet Union to remove their missiles from Cuba, otherwise there will be a third world war and the United States of America under that great President Kennedy gave an ultimatum to the Soviet Union to remove their missiles or face a world war. President Kennedy said, "We are also prepared to face destruction; we are prepared to face all consequences of war", not peace gentlemen, but war—"if you do not remove your Missiles from Cuba". And what happened in Korea? Again nations fought against each other because each one of them felt that they were fighting a war of liberation and a just war. What is happening in Viet Nam today? The whole world is on the brink of disaster moving the way of total destruction. Yet there are nations—great powers on both sides saying that we must support war of liberation. Can Kashmir be an exception? How Kashmir is an exception? The right to self-determination of the people in Viet Nam or anywere else in the world is the same. Is there any difference in the case of Kashmir? What is the difference? If one single member of the House wants to tell me, I will sit down. Let him say what is the difference.

The arguments, that the future of five crores of people of East Pakistan was jeopardized for five million people of Jammu and Kashmir is a pathetic and false argument. That the future of five crores of people of East Pakistan was jeopardised for the future of five million people of Jammu

and Kashmir is only, Sir, a false argument. It is bankrupt and an immoral argument. It is a wholly bankrupt and immoral argument. If that is to be the criterion of a just struggle of supporting the right of self-determination that five crores must not be sacrificed, it is an assumption, in any case that five crores were being sacrificed for five million, but if you carry it to its logical conclusion, then in the end only Mymensingh district will remain as a part of Pakistan because, Mymensingh district is the most populated district of Pakistan. You will say all right, do not sacrifice five crores for five million. They cannot say do not sacrifice. Do not sacrifice one crore and four million people of Sind. Then you will say, let Baluchistan go, Sind go, parts of Pakistan will be slowly and gradually swallowed up by India because 5 crores or 2 crores or one crore will be running the risk of destruction. And then only the Mymensingh district will be left, and then the most populated thana of the Mymensingh district will remain as a part of Pakistan. Can that be the argument that a heroic and great nation of Pakistan is going to put forward in this National Assembly—in this august House—in this supreme legislature which has heroic people who have fought for Pakistan—men like Mr. Nurul Amin and Shah Azizur Rahman and others. Nations, destinies are not judged by mathematical calculations. There is no arithmatical formula. It may be true—it may be five million—it may be three million—it may be one million. We have heard this argument in Pakistan that why should five million people be sacrificed? I must say to the credit of India, and the House knows and the people of Pakistan know that I am not an apologist of India—I never heard this argument from the Indian leaders. I have never heard from a single leader of India why should four hundred million people of India be sacrificed for the five million people of Kashmir? Why should four hundred million people of India sacrifice so much in terms of economic resources for the five million people of Jammu and Kashmir whose loyalty is with Pakistan? Why should the people in Calcutta suffer from starvation? Why should the people of Kerala who are crying for want of a bowl of rice suffer for five million people of Jammu and Kashmir? Why should Pakistan not adopt a similar attitude with greater fervour? Is it not a disservice to our cause not to do so? In the advancement of her chauvinistic and colonial ambitions, India wants to hold on to Jammu and Kashmir irrespective of the riots in Calcutta, irrespective of the starvation and irrespective of the other consequences and knowing that the people of Jammu and Kashmir in due process will become part of Pakistan. But this argument is a bankrupt argument which I have heard....

Jammu and Kashmir is a disputed territory. It has been a disputed territory for the last eighteen years and it continues to be a disputed territory and all

the people everywhere and most of all the people of Pakistan have a legal and moral right to support the struggle of the people of Jammu and Kashmir for emancipation from foreign bondage. The Jammu and Kashmir is a disputed territory. Even for India Kashmir is a disputed territory. The support for the people of Jammu and Kashmir as I said has been forthcoming from all over the world.

India invaded Pakistan as a result of the struggle of Jammu and Kashmir. India should have invaded Pakistan when Algeria was fighting France for its self-determination. India should have invaded Pakistan when Tunisia, Morocco and other countries were fighting for their self-determination. There was no justification in law and in morality for India to invade Pakistan as a result of the culmination of the fight of the people of Jammu and Kashmir for their self-determination. But, Sir, why India invaded Pakistan? India invaded Pakistan because it used Jammu and Kashmir as a pretext. It must not be forgotten that it is not just Jammu and Kashmir which is at stake. It is not for the people to say here that Jammu and Kashmir is a thousand miles away because West Pakistan is a thousand miles away. India cannot tolerate the existence of Pakistan and that is why on the pretext of Jammu and Kashmir war was unleashed on Pakistan. India on the pretext of the struggle of the people of Jammu and Kashmir wanted to destroy Pakistan and that is why twelve or more of India's finest Divisions whose guns and wheels were greased by great powers made an onslaught on Sialkot and Lahore to destroy Pakistan, because in the destruction of Pakistan lay India's most sublime and finest dreams. But the aggressor was brought to a halt.

It was an epic struggle. It was a most glorious chapter in the glory-studded history of Pakistan. It stood like a formidable and impregnable wall. This nation stood to a man against the terrible onslaught. Ours was a mighty victory. It was a victory of the people of Pakistan, a glittering crown was worn by the Armed Forces of Pakistan. It was a victory in which the whole nation shared. The people of the Punjab will no longer have to tell the world that this is the Punjab, this is Lahore, this is where the Shalimar Gardens are; this is where Iqbal was born. The world will be told that these are the people of Punjab who resisted 12 Divisions of India and destroyed the might of India. The people of Sind no longer will have to tell the world and refer them to the battle of Miani in 1847. The people of Sind have only to tell the foreigners that these were the Hurs who went right into India and occupied vast regions of Indian territory with their bare hands. The people of Bengal no longer will have to say that this is the cultural renaissance of the subcontinent. They will tell the world that this is the region on which India dared not lift its little finger. The people of Swat and the people of Dir and the other gallant regions do not have to say that this is the land of brave

Pathans, because they showed their bravery in the way they carried their muskets and they fought a great war against the hordes of India and against predatory and wanton aggression against Pakistan. The Whole people of Pakistan, everywhere, Punjab, Sind, Baluchistan, North West Frontier, Bengal, all rallied as one man against India. And what is India? India is Europe without Russia. Such a formidable and mighty force got pitted against the small and heroic nation, and why did we succeed? We succeeded because God was on our side. Because, Mr. Masiur Rehman, Pakistan is a God-made country, and not a man-made country.

Sir, we are told that war is a terrible thing. You do not know the consequences of war. Those who have fought any war know what war means. For 200 years, ladies and gentlemen, we have not fought a war, and now we have just seen a glimpse of war; we have just seen a glitter of war. For 200 years the people of this country did not fight a war of self-defence, a war of dignity. Our people have fought in Tripoli; they have fought in Italy. They have died in other foreign lands fighting for their foreign powers. But what a magnificent and beautiful difference there is in fighting for your own country as against fighting for foreigners. For the first time in 200 years, these people, gallant and glorious people, fought for their own homeland and no sacrifice can be measured in a balance of equity. This is the greatest equity to fight for your own homeland and to fight for your own country.

We are talking in terms of losing five thousand men or so. One hundred million of the people of Pakistan have fought a war and a million can sacrifice themselves for a greater cause and can face any consequence or any disaster. We have fought for foreigners and more people have died for their cause. Has that been a greater honour for us? Do we recount their services, the services of the people who died fighting for the British earlier? Let us take a balance-sheet of the past and the present, and we will find that we have fought for our homeland, for the great soil of Pakistan. There is a great difference in fighting for the foreigners and in fighting for your own country, and yet we are told we do not know what war means. Those who have known wars, they know what war means. Let us take the case of Germany. Germany fought a war in 1864. It fought a war in 1866; it fought a war in 1870; it fought a war in 1914 and in 1939. It was destroyed after Hitler's plunder of Europe in 1939 and yet we are told that Germany must be contained because Germany wants to fight against those who have fought war more successfully and continuously. Destroyed and decimated, they are prepared to go to war, but we who have not fought for 200 years a war of liberation should not say that a great disaster has taken place and we have lost so many people.

We never lost anyone. Each one is a martyr to the greatness of Pakistan.

Each one of them has contributed to the glory of Pakistan. Each one of them has shown to the world that this is a great and glorious nation. These lives have never been lost; they can never be forgotten. Those lives which fought for an imperial power will never be remembered, but each single life, each Jawan, each Colonel, each officer, who fought for the soil of Pakistan, is now in our heart and we shall cherish them.

War is a terrible thing, but this war was thrust on us. It was not of our choosing. It was not an aggressive war. It was thrust on us and we had to accept the challenge. There was no alternative to the challenge of predatory and habitual aggressor who since 1947 has aggressed continuously, who has aggressed in Junagadh, in Mangrol, in Manavadar, in Hyderabad, in Jammu and Kashmir, in Goa, against China; that great aggressor whetted by his appetite for aggression, launched his final attack against Pakistan, and all we had to do was to face the aggressor and in fulfilling that commitment, we have fulfilled a great role to the people of Pakistan. And yet, Sir, it is a tragedy, a shameful slander, I would say, not just a tragedy, but shameful slander, that there are those amongst us who have been brain-washed and who ask why we started the war. We did not start war. You have all the evidence in the world to know that we were the victims of aggression. The British Prime Minister, who is not elected by the Basic Democrats of Pakistan, did say that India committed aggression against us. The great leaders of Asia and Africa not beholden to any privilege or to any import licence told us that India committed aggression against us. The whole world says that we were the victims of aggression.

We were a smaller country pitted against a powerful one; and we could not only hold that country at bay, but ours was the victory.

And I am told that some of the Members of the House have a grievance that this policy of war which, as I have said, was thrust on us, and was not of our making, it was such that it left East Pakistan defenceless; it left East Pakistan isolated. Now, these are very important statements, that East Pakistan was left defenceless, and that East Pakistan was isolated. I would like you to share my thoughts on the subject.

To the extent to which I can reveal the facts, for the satisfaction, not only of the Members of this House, but for the five crores of people of East Pakistan, who constitute the majority of the people of Pakistan; and they must know because it is not fair to them to think that, although this war was thrust on us we did not anticipate it; and that we did not take necessary safeguards. You must know for one thing that you were isolated, that is true; and this is inherent in the scheme of Partition. But I would like to ask you: Is it not preferable to be isolated than to be subject to aggression? Which part of the country was subjected to the aggression of 12 Divisions of Indian Army and the onslaught of the finest armaments and materials? It was

West Pakistan. I think it was a blessing that the majority of our people were safe from aggression. Isolation is preferable to being victims of aggression, to be overtaken, God forbid, by India. General Chaudhri is said to have remarked that by the evening he and his Jawans would be sitting in Lahore, and that they will indulge in rapine and plunder. These were the remarks that we heard in West Pakistan, and we had to face that situation. We were the direct victims of aggression, and I would say, objectively speaking, it is better to be isolated than to be a victim of aggression.

Secondly, Sir, in so far as the defence of East Pakistan is concerned, I am not going to reveal any secrets. What I say is not a revelation. It is known to the Great Powers, it is known to the United States of America, it is known to the People's Republic of China, and perhaps it is known to the Soviet Union, why East Pakistan was insulated from the conflict. East Pakistan was not insulated from the conflict because India had some special love for East Pakistan. East Pakistan was regarded to be a territory over which the Indian troops and armies will just walk through. We were always told that in the event of a war between India and Pakistan, East Pakistan would be in the bag before we get up to load our guns. Then why? Ask yourselves, why did India not attack East Pakistan? Why was not East Pakistan attacked? What were the reasons for it? These are important considerations. These are considerations of primordial importance to the future of this country.

Some Members of the House have said that there were three considerations which prevented Indians from attacking East Pakistan—God, monsoons, and the ultimatum from China. As Muslims we bow to the mercy of God; we forget the monsoons; and we talk about the ultimatum from China. And this was the subject matter of discussions which took place between the United States' envoy and the Chinese representative at Warsaw. The defence of East Pakistan and the attack on East Pakistan was the subject-matter of consideration between the United States' representatives and those of the Chinese People's Republic at Warsaw, and it was during this period that the United States' Ambassador to Pakistan came with the proposal that East Pakistan should be insulated and quarantined from the war. Why? After all, the attack was on the whole of the country. The whole country was subject to attack. Why should East Pakistan be insulated and quarantined from war? You people are not more pious than we are; you people are part and parcel of our country; you people have all the greatness and the failings of our country: but why should East Pakistan have been quarantined from war? What was the reason? Why was India so anxious not to invade East Pakistan? I say with all the responsibility at my command that India could not dare to lift its little finger on East Pakistan.

All this notwithstanding, all this one day will come to light. The whole of the people of Pakistan will know everything in its fullest detail, with all the commas, semi-colons and full-stops. But what I have said today is what is known to the Great Powers, and what was reported by the "*New York Times*", that this was the subject-matter of discussion in Warsaw. Therefore, I am not revealing any secret. If it comes to the "*New York Times*", that at Warsaw it was discussed, then I am not revealing something which is secret. But one day the whole country, the nation, the people of East Pakistan will know that the leadership of West Pakistan thought more of East Pakistan than of West Pakistan.

At the same time, I can understand a sense of some frustration. I can understand it, because the people of East Pakistan are very patriotic; and they must have felt a sense of frustration, not because they were isolated, but because they were not merged in the conflict. They wanted to be a part of the aggression. Frustration would not have been there if India had attacked East Pakistan. They feel frustrated, not because they were isolated, but because they were not attacked. But there should be no misgivings because at the end of all wars there is an element of frustration. But when the dust of war settles, reality becomes clearer. There should be no frustration because it must be remembered that the blood of East Pakistani martyrs was merged with blood of the Punjabi martyrs in the defence of Sialkot and in the defence of Lahore. It was a merged blood. This is the blood that has come together to sanctify and solidify the nation for all times notwithstanding six points or twenty points. The people of Pakistan have come together. There has been a consummation of the blood of the martyrs on the soil of Pakistan. Therefore, we are not concerned with these problems of distance. Political issues can be discussed at any time. This war has proved that Pakistan is indivisible, imperishable, and it stands united as one force and one factor, as the great redeemer, as the beacon light of the right of self-determination of the people, and as a nation committed to an ideological struggle for the emancipation of mankind and for the end of exploitation.

Tashkent Declaration

Now, I come to the famous Tashkent Declaration. I have already said that this declaration is a declaration of intent; and one of my learned friends, who I am sure is a scholar of Jurisprudence, knows what is the difference between a declaration of intent and a contractual obligation. A declaration of intent is this that both the leaders of India and Pakistan declare that they would like to see an end of disputes between India and Pakistan; that they would strive to put an end to disputes. It did not, the Tashkent Declaration did not stipulate the various measures which should bring those disputes to an end. If the Tashkent Declaration had said that the dispute of Jammu

and Kashmir will be settled on the following lines, stipulated stage by stage all the steps for settlement, it would have been a contractual obligation. But it was only a declaration of intent.

And now I would like to trouble the House with a reference to Tashkent Declaration. As a token of our appreciation of the Soviet efforts, I am reading from a Soviet document given to me by the Soviet Ambassador. I would like to read the nine Articles if you would permit me. Article 1 says, but I will try to be as brief as possible, so please do not be impatient. Article 1 says: "The Prime Minister of India and the President of Pakistan agree that both sides must exert all efforts to create good neighbourly relations between India and Pakistan in accordance with the United Nations Charter". Mind you, note the words "in accordance with the United Nations Charter". Each is required through an obligation under the Charter not to have recourse to force and to settle their disputes through peaceful means. They consider that the interest of peace in their region and particularly Indo-Pakistan sub-continent and indeed in the interest of the people of India and Pakistan were not served by the continuance of tension between the two countries.

It was against this background that Jammu and Kashmir was discussed and each side set forth its respective position. Now, my submission is that Article 1 is the most important Article. I am not an expert in Jurisprudence, though I went to Oxford to study law. I think the Law Minister will be able to say it better. Article 1 says that in the background of tension the dispute over Jammu and Kashmir was discussed. How and why was Jammu and Kashmir discussed? Because Jammu and Kashmir is the main factor and the main bone of contention between India and Pakistan and that is why in the background of conflict and trouble it was discussed; and it was in accordance with the United Nations Charter. Therefore, we did not enter into a new commitment. There is no new commitment. We are already a Member of the United Nations—both India and Pakistan. Therefore, in declaring our intention to act in accordance with the United Nations Charter, we have not entered into a new commitment. As members of the United Nations and in accordance with the provisions of the Charter we are seeking peace. The dispute over Jammu and Kashmir is the most important problem and the most important dispute that plagues India and Pakistan. What is the United Nations commitment? Let us go through the United Nations Charter. First of all, the preamble of the United Nations Charter. "To save succeeding generations from the scourage of war which twice in our life time has brought untold misery to mankind." This is a pre-existing obligation. The obligation is not on us; it is on India because there are existing treaties between India and Pakistan for the settlement of the Kashmir dispute. So, we have not entered into a new agreement,

whereas India has reconfirmed its agreement for the settlement. This is not a commitment which is against us. This is a commitment which is against India because in its confirmation it has committed to settle Jammu and Kashmir dispute according to International Law and Treaties. Then, to practise tolerance, to ensure by the acceptance of principles and institution of method that armed force shall not be used. This is a pre-existing understanding. So, in the interest of world peace armed force shall not be used. This is a principle which is existing. Now, Article 1: "To promote international peace and security and take effective measures for the prevention and removal of threat and for the prevention of acts of aggression". India is the aggressor. It went against India; not a commitment against Pakistan . . . "and to fulfil its commitment as laid down in Article 1, para 2".—but the most important, it says: "To develop friendly relations among nations based on respect and self-determination of people". This is again directed against India, because they have to respect the people's right of self-determination. Therefore, what are the commitments of India? The commitments are that they will not resort to aggression and that they will fulfil treaty obligations and that they shall respect the peoples' right to self-determination. How can this Article No. 1 become a liability to Pakistan? Now, from Article 1—everything stems from the basic article, and India has been under a moral commitment and a legal commitment under the Tashkent Declaration sanctified by the United Nations Charter to fulfil its treaty obligation to respect the peoples' right of self-determination and not to wage aggression as is India's habit.

Article 2 says that the Prime Minister of India and the President of Pakistan agreed that all armed personnel shall be withdrawn to August 5 position. This is again not a new commitment. This is in the September 20th Resolution. The September 20th Resolution of the United Nations says that the armed forces personnel of both countries shall be withdrawn. So, here again is reconfirmation of the United Nations obligation.

Now the Prime Minister of India and the President of Pakistan agree—Article 3—that the relations between India and Pakistan shall be based on the principle of non-interference in the internal affairs on each country. I again go back to the Charter and the Charter says in Article 2, para 7, "nothing contained in the Charter shall authorise the United Nations to intervene in matters which are essentially within the jurisdiction of any State or shall require the Members to submit. Article 2, para 7 has already enjoined us not to interfere in each other's internal affairs. Now, has the Charter of the United Nations ever come in the way of the right of self-determination for the people of Jammu and Kashmir? So, why should the Tashkent Declaration come in the way of Pakistan? Inspite of the Charter which was signed in 1948 in San-Francisco, there have been wars between

India and Pakistan on two occasions, in 1947 and 1948 and in 1965. The Charter already said that member countries shall not interfere in the internal affairs of each other, but Jammu and Kashmir is not the internal affair of India; it is not an integral part of India irrespective of what they say. Therefore, we are fortified here by the context of the past. This Article 3 has no relevancy whatsoever to our right to support the people of Jammu and Kashmir and that is why the Charter of the United Nations has supported the Resolution of August, 1948 and 5th January, 1949. If we were to interfere in India's internal affairs, then there would have been no Resolution of August, 1948 nor of 5th January, 1949. The Security Council would have told us that you are interfering in India's internal affairs, but that is not the position. The Security Council knew that Jammu and Kashmir was a disputed territory; the whole world knows it. India has occupied and usurped the territory of Jammu and Kashmir against the wishes of the people. Therefore, it is not an interference in India's internal affairs and the Tashkent Declaration only reiterates our obligation of the United Nations Charter. It is not a forecloser and it is not a bar. Article No. 4—The Prime Minister of India and the President of Pakistan have agreed that both sides will discourage any propaganda against each other. Now, as far as the propaganda is concerned it is a different thing to pursue one's legitimate right to support the right cause and to indulge in propaganda. Propaganda means villification, propaganda means slander, propaganda means abuse. No respectable and self-respecting country would like to indulge in propaganda. This is not our policy. We do not indulge in propaganda. We are not going into India's affairs that they should have one Prime Minister or the other, that India should give food to its people or buy armaments and all that. That is a separate question. But as far as Jammu and Kashmir is concerned, as far as the question of liberation is concerned, as far as the question of eviction of Muslims is concerned, as far as the question of justice is concerned, we are not precluded from espousing and propagating these causes.

Then Article 6—The Prime Minister of India and the President of Pakistan have agreed to consider measures towards normalisation of economic relations and the implementation of the existing agreements between India and Pakistan. Are those agreements in favour of Pakistan or in India's favour? Do we have to give Berubari to India or India has to give Berubari to us? Has India to fulfil the agreement on Jammu and Kashmir or do we have an obligation to fulfil? There are two important international agreements which India has to fulfil towards us, that is the transfer of Berubari and transfer of Jammu and Kashmir. Are these agreements against us or is it against India?

Article 1 goes against India, Article 2 goes against India, Article 3 and Article 4 go against India. Then, the Prime Minister of India and the

President of Pakistan agreed that the talks will continue to discuss the question of eviction of Muslims. Now here under Article 8 as far as the eviction of Muslims are concerned, are these people evicted from Pakistan into India or these are people who were evicted from India into Pakistan? Here again it is the people of India that are being evicted into Pakistan and not the people of Pakistan who are being evicted into India. Who has to gain from it? Pakistan has to gain from this provision because it is India that has evicted Indian Muslims from Assam, Tripura and West Bengal and from Rajasthan. India is accountable. India is answerable and not Pakistan. Are these Muslims going from East Pakistan to India or are these Muslims coming from India to East Pakistan?

Then Article 9—Talks about the machinery and this is important. On the 9th of January when we were discussing the machinery I put a direct question to Premier Kosygin. I said that, "in this question of machinery you must know that as far as we are concerned we can only accept it if Jammu and Kashmir is made the main dispute for determination by this machinery", and he said, "Jammu and Kashmir is in dispute and naturally you have a right to bring this up under Article 9". And that is why in the Ministerial Conference we brought up this matter.

Now, it has been said that the Tashkent Declaration is a No-war Pact. The Tashkent Declaration is not a no-war pact. We cannot accept a no-war pact when the disputes of Jammu and Kashmir, Farakka Barrage, Eviction of Muslims, all these problems remain to be solved. The Tashkent Declaration is not a no-war pact. But suppose some individual in his fancy would like to contend it is a no-war pact. Here again, the Charter is there. What does the Charter say in Article 51? The Charter says, 'nothing in the present Charter shall impede the inherent right of individual or collective self-defence.' The people of Jammu and Kashmir are the victims of armed aggression by India and nothing in the Charter will preclude our right to come to their support and to help them to secure their right to self-determination. Article 51 is an overriding Article and as such we have the right under the Charter to the defence of our people against India's aggression.

As far as the Tashkent Declaration is concerned, Article 103 says that in the event of a conflict between the obligations of the members of the United Nations under the present Charter and their obligations under any other international agreement, their obligations under the present Charter shall prevail. So, the United Nations Charter is the supreme document and if there is any inconsistency between the Tashkent Declaration and the United Nations Charter, anything which is inconsistent with our obligations to United Nations, to that extent the Tashkent Declaration is null and void.

Now we come to the Soviet initiative. Who is responsible for the strained relations between Soviet Union and Pakistan? This is a legacy which we carried with us. There was a time when relations between the Soviet Union and Pakistan were non-existent. We are not responsible for that. The previous regimes pursued that policy in their better wisdom. This great neighbour to the north with all its industrial power and one of the genuine Great Powers was something which did not exist in our consideration. There were no delegations that went to Soviet Union. There have been no contacts. As a matter of fact, one of my rare privileges is to be the Minister who for the first time went to Soviet Union to conclude an Oil Agreement in1960. I know the difficulties I had to go through in arriving at that agreement and that was the first time that we had any direct relationship with the Soviet Union. We talk about the Soviet Veto. When we talk of it, we must ask why there was a Soviet Veto. What was the consideration that brought it about? What was India's attitude and what was Pakistan's attitude to the Soviet Union. There must be a gradual and a slow and imperceptible change like summer going into autumn and like autumn going into winter.

You cannot expect the Great Powers to turn turtle. You cannot expect them to turn round by 180 degrees. We require closer contact. We have to exchange views. We have to keep on convincing others through talks and associations. The Soviet Union regards self-determination as one of its foremost principles which Karl Marx enunciated and which influenced the activities of Lenin. There has to be a gradual and solemn approach in order to focuss their attention on the fact that here is a power, small power, which demands self-determination and if the Soviet Union does not support self-determination after her relations with Pakistan have been normalized it will have no logical basis to claim certain advantage on account of its ideological standing. If on the other hand the relations between the Soviet Union and Pakistan be such that they can not possibly support us then they can say that they believe in self-determination but our relations are such that they cannot support us then no one will criticise them. So, first of all, we have to establish normal relations with the Soviet Union.

The most important question and the prime factor in the Tashkent Declaration is that the Soviet Union has recognized that there is a dispute between India and Pakistan in respect of Jammu and Kashmir. In the past, I remember in 1962, the representative of the Soviet Union supported the Indian points of view in the Security Council and stated that Jammu and Kashmir was an integral part of India. If morality is on our side and if our cause is right and if the Soviet Union is a believer in the ideology of self-determination, in that case it will have to come round to our support with the gradual improvement in our relations.

Sir, the main thing of the Tashkent Declaration is that the Soviet Union has accepted for the first time that there is a dispute relating to Jammu and Kashmir. This is a sufficient moral support to our assertion. We have to tell the Soviet Union that they have got to support us if they believe in the principles enunciated by Karl Marx regarding self-determination. If they abandon that principle, then every other people will say that the Soviet Union is abandoning the principle of self-determination. At the present moment, they have supported the fact that there is a dispute. This is going a hundred miles from its previous position. That is a break-through from its original stand that Kashmir and Jammu is an integral part of India. On the 9th of January last, when I put this question to Mr. Kosygin, he said that certainly we can take this up in the Ministerial meeting.

Now, Sir, I come to Pakistan's relation with the United States of America. Pakistan always maintained cordial and friendly relations, and it was only after the China-India conflict that a new strategy developed and our relations with the United States were influenced by it. It is not natural nor is it desirable for a small state to have conflict with the great powers, and undoubtedly the United States is a great power. On the other hand, it would have been opposed to the very basis of Pakistan's ideology, if we had not taken exception to certain changes in the United States position in the sub-continent. As a matter of fact, it is only because we expressed our apprehension; and if we had not shown our concern, then the United States might have been misguided. However, strained relationship developed between our two countries, but since the visit of our President to the United States, these difficulties and misunderstanding have been explained and at the moment our relations have improved.

An honourable member of this House made the most uncharitable allegation and said that Pakistan has arrived at some invidious arrangement with Soviet Russia and the U.S.A. in Washington. The question here is that if Pakistan or the President of Pakistan was to arrive at some invidious arrangement, then why should we have strained relations and why should we have faced one crisis after another in our relations with the United States of America? It is a contradiction and a basic and fundamental contradiction if we were to succumb to the pressure of the great powers. It is impossible for Pakistan to compromise on its fundamental interests. This nation is an Islamic nation and is backed by ideology. This Muslim nation cannot be purchased with 400 or 500 million dollars. We are Muslims. We are committed to the traditions of Islam. We shall never sell away Pakistan and refrain from the right struggle of the people. Please, therefore, do not think that there was any consideration of economic development or any other motive that could have led to an agreement in

Washington, prejudicial to the interests of Pakistan. I can return to my constituency and say to my people that you rather stop development work but do not undermine the ideology of Pakistan, and I am sure that they will accept the position. I think that the whole of the population of Pakistan will accept this position. It is for this House to judge such a situation. I say that we have no strained relations with America. If we have, it is for the legitimate protection of our interests. I would say that the President's visit to the United States of America was very beneficial, because we were able to explain our difficulties and our points of view and motivations and also other factors that constitute the affairs of a nation and the affairs of a community.

I would like to say here that the United States has not been a classical imperial power, it has not dominated any part of Asia, perhaps the Philippines and some other places are exceptions. So they are not cognizant of the aroma of Asia and of the forces at work among Asian nations. They are not like the British or the French or the German. The British ruled the sub-continent for 200 years, so they know a little about the sub-continent, the French also held sway over parts of this region, so they are familiar with the problems. But the United States of America has not been in power in Asia and is not, therefore, acquainted with the problems of Asia. It is unfamiliar with the motivations or the nature of Asian forces. Why even the British are not entirely familiar, because theirs was a master and servant relationship. The master knows little about those he rules, those who are ruled know the weakness of the masters.

Even an imperial power was not familiar with the motivations and feelings and aspirations of the people of Asia and Africa. How do you expect the United States to be familiar with the aspirations of Asia and Africa, merely because they are a Great Power? Mr. Humphrey, Vice-President of the United States, has yesterday urged for the friendship of the people of China. He said that, "the people of China must not be isolated. We must take an opportunity to show our friendship to the Chinese people. We respect and value their contribution to civilization". He said, "We know too little about Asia. We need to do our level best to widen American interest in Asia including Communist China".

Here is a statement of the Vice-President of the United States who says, "We know too little about Asia", and I am giving the reasons why? They have not been a classical imperial power and their contact has been an alien contact. It is an association of comradeship which develops feeling of acquaintance. Who is Vice-President of the United States? Roosevelt was Vice-President, he then became a great American President; Truman, he was Vice-President, he became President and responsible for great decisions like the 4-points, responsible for dropping bombs on Hiroshima

and Nagasaki; Johnson himself was Vice-President, and here the present Vice-President of the U.S.A. admits that the American people know too little about Asia and this is the difficulty. It is because the American people know too little about Asia, that the Asian problems and difficulties cannot be met by computer control. You must know the aroma of Asia, you must know the dust and love it, you must know how to live with the people. The affairs and factors at work in Asia cannot be presented in terms of communism and anti-communism. There is a new nationalism in Asia, we want to develop our own society, we want to develop our own political institutions, we want to develop our own economy, our own objectives. This should not be judged in terms of communism and capitalism.

There is an Asian way, and we all are developing our own society. We have the oldest society of the world. This continent has produced great religions and great civilizations. Our direction should be an Asian direction. If we say that it is communist direction or capitalist direction, it is not true. This is the fundamental problem between the Eastern and Western World, that the urge of Asia is the urge of self-assertion, it is an urge of the personality of Asia. The sooner they realize it, the better it is for them and the sooner they stop dubbing us to any block, it is better for us and for them. We want to achieve dignity and self-respect, we want to end poverty, we do not want those things which are the product of foreign association because those factors cannot answer our problems, those factors are alien factors, they cannot be grafted in the body politic of Asia, they cannot just harmonize with the Asian factors, we cannot have injection of foreign elements and we cannot say that we are communists or capitalists, we are not a people who can be categorised by 'isms'. We have our own self-assertion, we have our own feeling of confidence, we have our own feeling of self-respect and I say these things in order to let them know a little more about Asia. They must realise this so that we can be friends; we must be friends and well-wishers of other countries. Our revolution is like the French Revolution against oppression and tyranny; that does not mean that we are for one 'ism' or the other. It does not mean that we belong to another social order. We want an Asian way as our own way without any domination. The Western World must understand the problems of Asia. Do not reject and disregard the true leadership of Asia. The Asian leadership must first of all be faithful and must serve the Asian people. The people of Pakistan must be served first. There is no question of 'ism' or ideology involved here. Why there is misunderstanding, preconceived prejudices? There should be a totally different environment. Don't be unfair to the western civilization. We may have a red tie, but our heart is Pakistani. Our soul, we cannot decontaminate from our own

civilization. With foreign education, we will not be able to answer the problems of an Asian society, they will never be able to harmonize themselves with the music of Asia, and the music of Asia is a Revolution of greatness and of justice.

Now, Sir, here again Mr. Humphrey has said:

"The people of China must not be isolated. We must take every opportunity to show our friendship to Chinese people. We respect and value their many contributions to civilization". And then Senator Fulbright said, and this is very important, Senator Fulbright is a very distinguished and honourable Member of Foreign Relations Committee. He said on the 13th March as the Chairman of that Committee:

> "That U.S. objections to the admission of China to the United Nations may be softened or withdrawn as a result of hearings on China in the Senate".

Speaking on a 90-minute televised panel discussion on China Fulbright said:

> "Administration officials had told me privately they thought the hearings which have just begun would have a beneficial effect". He said "I think they feel it will give them greater freedom of action when it comes up again, as it undoubtedly will, in the United Nations".

Now Vice-President Humphrey says "We must have relationship with China. We cannot ignore Chinese contribution to world civilization". And Senator Fulbright says "We must soften our attitude towards China and we must see that China becomes Member of the United Nations". Now, if you say that Senator Fulbright is a communist that is another thing. He comes from the deep South. He comes from the conservative South. Now, here you have Senator Fulbright saying that attitude towards China must be softened and China must be admitted to the United Nations. This has been our position regarding China. We have said, China is a neighbour of Pakistan and we have to develop friendly and cordial relations with all our neighbours first. We have said that China is a nation of 700 million people, that cannot be ignored and Vice-President Humphrey says that China cannot be ignored. This has been our position. We have said that China should be admitted to the United Nations; Senator Fulbright now says China should be admitted to the United Nations. We have said, no problems of Asia can be truly settled without the participation of China. Sooner or later, sooner than later, you will have to accept this position.

Now the leaders of the United States say the same thing. Having said this much, having spoken the truth, having said something which is self-evident why are we misunderstood? It is because great powers with their vagaries can change their positions and they can change their attitudes and

we are caught in the vortex of great power rivalries. So, we have to determine the problems on their merits. We believe that we will have to solve our problems on their objective merits. Then, sooner or later, others will also agree with that situation. This is what is happening. This is an irresistible force, an uncontrollable force of history. You cannot ignore 700 million people. You cannot forget the fact that China is a Great Power. You cannot forget that Chinese participation in the Disarmament Conference is necessary. Senators Kennedy—Robert Kennedy, Edward Kennedy, Senator George, all these people say this,—Walter Lippman may be a Sinophile—but all these people are saying the same thing. How are we at variance? We, who know the aroma, the scent and the perfume of Asia, must be in a better position to know what these difficulties are.

When we propound these things, all sorts of sinister interpretations are given, collusion, agreements, these are not relevant points; what is relevant is to determine issues on their merits, not to be subjected to subjective interpretation. So, gradually, slowly, this position is being realized everywhere and Pakistan having said it, articulated it, I think we have made a contribution. We have made a contribution without being presumptuous to the development of these relations. Therefore, sometimes strains and difficulties are inherent in situations. You cannot have goodwill all the time; you cannot have tranquillity, normalcy and peace all the time. You have to accept the challenge. You have to face the odds. So, I think that by facing these consequences, by holding our head upright, by saying that this is a situation, which has to be reckoned with, we have not really caused misunderstanding with the United States. We have, on the other hand, caused better appreciation in the United States of the factors and the forces that are at work.

Taking all things into account, Sir, what is a great power? A great power is not just territory, it is not just vastness of territory. If that were a great power, India would be a great power. India is not a great power although it is a vast country. A great power is not merely one that acquires technological know-how and excellence. Because, if that were the case, Switzerland and Sweden would be great powers. A great power is not a country which merely has atomic weapons. If that were the case, sooner or later, Israel would become a great power. A great power, Sir, is an amalgam of all these things—vastness of territory, resources, economic wealth, technological progress, and, above all, in the modern context, a great power is a power with an ideology. A great power without an ideology cannot remain a great power in the modern context of the world. That is why I said America and Soviet Union will have to take into account whether to support self-determination or not in Jammu and Kashmir, because in supporting or not supporting the people of Jammu and Kashmir on

self-determination it places its ideology at stake.

United States of America is a great power, not merely because of its resources, not merely because of its technological ability. United States is a great power because it is wedded to the ideals of Jefferson; it is wedded to the ideals of Abraham Lincoln, of Hamilton, of Wilson, and that is how its basic attributes of a great power are preserved. Therefore, Wilsonian concept of self-determination is at stake in the final position that the United States takes on Jammu and Kashmir. Now, China, which is another ideological power, has taken the correct position on Jammu and Kashmir in accordance with its ideology and supported the people's right to self-determination in Jammu and Kashmir, and although quantitatively and qualitatively in terms of material resources, in terms of atomic arsenal, in terms of technological know-how, China is inferior to Soviet Union and United States, China is today regarded as one of the great factors, because ideologically it has not compromised its position. If any great power ideologically compromises that position they will have to contend with a great dilemma which may strike at the roots of its being a great power.

Now, Sir, as I have said at the very beginning that Pakistan is the product of self-determination; Pakistan is the most magnificent product of self-determination because out of the establishment of Pakistan other people, other communities also derived a sense of protection and it is for us to uphold the people's cause in Jammu and Kashmir, because it is only the completion of the process of Pakistan in this respect. But let me sound a note of warning that self-determination cannot come without the support of the majority; the majority must support the cause of self-determination. The majority in our country here are the people of East Pakistan. So it is not for the people of West Pakistan to determine whether we should pursue the right of self-determination for the people of Jammu and Kashmir; it is for the people of East Pakistan to determine and be the harbingers of the struggle, because they are in a majority.

If the people of East Pakistan think that Jammu and Kashmir is too far away and that these are problems which do not directly affect them, then let them come here and say so; because, without their support, there could have been no Pakistan no matter how great might have been the struggle of Punjab, Sind, Baluchistan and North-West Frontier Province. There could have been no Pakistan if the people of East Pakistan did not support Pakistan. This is a historical fact.

So, to take it to its logical conclusion, it is the majority of the people of our country whose will must prevail. I can boldly and clearly say that even if every individual in West Pakistan is prepared to be destroyed, we cannot espouse the cause of the people of Jammu and Kashmir because the majority

is here in East Pakistan. The determining factor is in East Pakistan, and they should guide us and they should tell us whether we should continue the process of self-determination or not, because it is for them to decide.

Sometimes, we are told that Kashmir is far away, that there are other problems—you must look to them. I tell you, Sir, this is a negation not of Jammu and Kashmir, this is a negation of Pakistan, because the difficulty we face either in East or West Pakistan is inherent. So it is no use saying that by abandoning the cause of Jammu and Kashmir we will be removing our difficulties. You will not be removing your difficulties; on the contrary, you will be whetting the appetite of an aggressor who launched his final attack on Pakistan. The struggle of Jammu and Kashmir will determine the final destiny of India itself and I know that the people of East Pakistan are prepared to face those consequences. The people of East Pakistan are foremost in the struggle for the people of Jammu and Kashmir. I feel this with all my heart—with all my soul, because with them and with us rests a great truth. I tell you, we are true. There can be no force, no strength greater than truth. Truth is on our side. I say this to you, because history has shown that truth is on our side. Decolonization must be removed from Jammu and Kashmir because it is the order of the day. Jammu and Kashmir cannot be an exception to the process of decolonization. India will have to abandon its colony in Jammu and Kashmir. You must not get Asia fatigued. Asia is not ripe for fatigue. Asia is too vibrant. She is fully alive. Asia has to stay, but those who want to abandon honest rule for vested interests feel that the cause is lost. Sir, our cause can only succeed if we pursue our struggle because our's is an honourable struggle sanctified by law and protected by Allah.

PART VI

RCD
MINISTERIAL COUNCIL

Closing Statement at the Second Meeting of R.C.D. Ministerial Council at Islamabad on March 19, 1965

Your Excellencies,

I thank you for your kind references to me and the Government of Pakistan. We are always delighted to welcome to Pakistan our brothers from Iran and Turkey.

We were all looking forward to meeting His Excellency Mr. Hasan Isik [Ishik], the Foreign Minister of Turkey. But, as you are aware, he has been prevented from joining in our deliberations owing to some fresh and unfortunate development in the Cyprus issue.

It is a happy feature of our meetings in RCD that they are conducted in a spirit of warm cordiality and sincerity. Without this so much progress in so short a time would not have been possible.

The two days of deliberations we have just concluded, and the decisions that have been taken, underline a wide range of co-operation between our three countries. The Report of the Planning Council indicates that substantial progress has been made in several fields and the Planning Council deserve our thanks for it.

We firmly believe in the future of RCD and I am confident that the momentum gained will not only be maintained but will be accelerated as time goes on.

We are not an exclusive club. RCD is a positive, peaceful co-operation for regional development. Our constructive efforts are being keenly watched by the developing nations, and our success may, in time, serve for other countries as a pattern for co-operation.

Only recently we have concluded consideration, with Indonesia, of very satisfactory arrangements for developing economic and cultural co-operation with that country on the lines of RCD.

The implementation of our plans in regard to cultural matters, tourism, communications and other fields has been gratifying and we have made good all-round progress.

With the appointment of a very able and exprienced Executive Secretary, His Excellency Mr. Fuad Rouhani, whom we all welcome, I am confident that the RCD Secretariat will be able to play fully the role assigned to it in our organizational matters. I wish him success in his work.

Before I close I would like to express on behalf of my delegation, and on my own behalf our warm thanks and sincere gratitude to the members of the delegations from Iran and Turkey for their generous co-operation. A spirit of perfect harmony prevailed throughout our meetings.

I would also like to thank all those who have been associated with the work of our meeting and have worked hard to make it a success.

Finally I would like to offer apologies for any lapses on our part or inconveniences that the Members of the two delegations may have experienced in this rugged and growing city of Islamabad. We cannot get the splendour or the charm either of Istanbul or Tehran. But if we have not been able to extend the same reception or entertainment I hope that lapse will be compensated by the sincerity and the warmth and affection with which we have received you and welcomed you to our country.

Thank you.

Opening Statement at the Third Meeting of R.C.D. Ministerial Council at Ankara on July 21, 1965

Mr. Chairman, Executive Secretary, Excellencies and Distinguished Delegates,

On behalf of the Pakistan delegation and on my own behalf, may I express my grateful thanks to our hosts, the Turkish Government, for their hospitality and the excellent arrangements they have made for this conference.

I also wish to express our warm appreciation to His Excellency Mr. Suat Hayri Urguplu, Prime Minister of the Republic of Turkey, for his inaugural address which has been most constructive.

It was in Turkey, a year ago, that the three Heads of State of Iran, Pakistan and Turkey established R.C.D. It is, therefore, in the fitness of things that on the occasion of the first anniversary of R.C.D. the meeting of the Ministerial Council should be held in Turkey.

The conception of R.C.D. has aroused great enthusiasm and generated a good deal of inspiration among the people of our three countries. The ideals which imbued the formation of R.C.D. have enlivened them and they sincerely hope that the constructive regional co-operation under R.C.D. will ensure for them a better and fuller life.

In this age of science and technology regional co-operation has become an effective instrument for development. This is so particularly for the developing countries which are harnessing their resources to achieve accelerated development so as to lift the burden of centuries' neglect and exploitation. We firmly believe that R.C.D. as an instrument of peaceful regional co-operation, holds great promise for the future of the people of this region.

Close historical ties and cultural affinities which bind our peoples will no doubt remain the moving spirit for the onward march of R.C.D.

Today, on the occasion of the first anniversary of R.C.D., we can recollect with satisfaction the achievements of R.C.D. In a short span of but a year, the R.C.D. has taken positive shape and made handsome progress particularly in the fields of trade, shipping, communications, tourism and cultural collaboration. The reduction in rates of surface mail, telegraph and telephone will facilitate communications among the peoples of the region and will thereby help promote better understanding among them. The conclusion of the Visa Abolition Agreement between the member countries has made possible for our peoples to move more freely than ever before within the region. The Agreement on Tourism, signed in October, 1964 will promote tourist traffic among the three countries and increase the flow of tourists into the region from other countries. Bilateral trade agreements, which have already been signed, will promote and expand trade between the member countries. The setting up of the Conference of the Shipping Companies of Iran, Pakistan and Turkey and the formation of the Joint Chamber of Commerce and Industry will foster and develop trade and investment opportunities. We are happy that a number of industries have been identified for development as Joint Purposes Enterprise and that a general agreement on technical co-operation has been reached. The Regional Cultural Institute, which has been established, will promote a closer understanding of the common cultural heritage of the three countries. R.C.D. Insurance Centre, which we hope will play an important role in the growth of industry in the region, was inaugurated in Karachi on July 5, 1965. In a message on the eve of its inauguration, President Ayub underlined that the establishment of the R.C.D. Insurance Centre was "another step forward in our effort to develop the economy of three countries through co-operation." These and other measures taken under the auspices of R.C.D. are indicative of the positive and constructive role it is destined to play in bringing about economic and cultural integration of the three countries and in raising the standard of living of our peoples.

We wish to place on record our warm appreciation for the useful work done by the Regional Planning Commission and the various Committees and Sub-Committees. It is their sincere efforts and hard work which have ensured smooth and satisfactory progress of R.C.D.

R.C.D. represents the concerted efforts of our three countries in regional co-operation for mutual benefit. I wish to reaffirm our faith in R.C.D. and confidence in its future. We are firmly resolved to work hard in full co-operation and complete understanding with our partners so that we can achieve the aims and purposes of R.C.D. laid down a year ago in Istanbul by the Heads of State of our three countries.

Closing Statement at the Third Meeting of R.C.D. Ministerial Council at Ankara on July 22, 1965

Excellencies and Fellow Delegates,

We have today reached the confluence of the end of first year of RCD and the beginning of the second. Quite naturally from such a position, I would like to look back to assess its record and see ahead for its prospects. I feel I have the good fortune to express to you the happiness of our people for having achieved what might have appeared last year a well nigh impossible target. We feel elevated at the record of our achievements and doubly reinforced in our hope of a very bright future for the RCD. Whether it was in the field of trade, shipping, joint enterprize, communication, or cultural and technical collaboration the record of success has been impressive. There were fields where progress was, for very understandable and justifiable reasons, somewhat slow. But that need not deter us from our path. We are confident that the second year will blossom forth with more heartening achievements than those produced in the first year. There are a few factors which stand out prominently in our association. First, perhaps RCD is one of those few institutions which fully enjoy the support and enthusiasm of the peoples concerned. There might have been speculative skepticism and critical misgivings about our intentions and the chances of our success. But one can today claim that RCD need not be looked upon with any such doubts. Second, a true fraternal spirit of collaboration and sincere desire of accommodation and respect for the views and problems of each other characterizes our deliberations. Third, RCD stands for our individual and collective prestige and honour. Fourth, it is an embodiment of the idea of economic wellbeing through self-help among three developing countries, countries without aid or advice from outside. The RCD is unique in this respect.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to express my delegation's appreciation of the way in which you conducted our deliberations.

I would like to place on record my appreciation of the valuable work done by the third RPC under the chairmanship of Mr. Memduh Aytur, the Head of the Turkish Planning Organization.

I feel equally happy to say that the RCD Secretariat is in the safe hands of a very able and dynamic personality of Mr. Fuad Rouhani and his small team of workers, who have managed to put the Secretariat on its feet within a very short period of time.

I would like once more to express my grateful appreciation to H.E. Mr. Suat H. Urgupulu, Prime Minister of Turkey, who very kindly inaugurated the session which I unfortunately missed.

I am accustomed to the generous and warm hospitality of the Turkish Government but their hostship and efficient servicing of our meeting have this time broken their own previous records.

Closing Statement at the Fourth Meeting of R.C.D. Ministerial Council at Islamabad on February 4, 1966

Excellencies,

I wish to thank you for the kind words which you have said in respect of the fourth Ministerial session of the R.C.D. which we are now concluding. If the session has been a success it is due largely to your sympathy, support and contribution. I wish to express my grateful thanks to His Excellency Mr. Abbas Aram, my distinguished colleague from Iran, for his continuing interest and efforts for the promotion of the concept and practice of the Regional Cooperation for Development. Equally, I wish to express my pleasure at welcoming His Excellency Mr. Ihsan Sabri Caglayangil, the Foreign Minister of Turkey, to these deliberations and look forward to a long period of fruitful cooperation.

Your Excellencies permit me to express my regrets at the somewhat inadequate and limited amenities available to you here, particularly when compared with those available in Tehran, Ankara or Istanbul. I hope you will overlook these deficiencies as Islamabad is still in its early stages of establishment.

Excellencies, I am pleased that the present session of the conference has been such a productive one. Indeed, it is a matter of gratification to my Government and to me personally that so much has been accomplished during the short period of the R.C.D's existence. The initial difficulties and hesitations have been overcome and replaced by a heartening sense of promise. We are moving steadily towards a better understanding of each other's aims, objectives and aspirations. Such an understanding is essential if we are to build the noble edifice which was conceived in Istanbul by the Heads of our three states in July 1964.

The present session has shown that we have passed from the stage of

planning and programming into the stage of implementation. As such, this session is likely to be considered as an important milestone in the history of our organization. I am particularly pleased with the progress which has been achieved in the field of joint-purpose enterprizes. I see that feasibility studies in respect of eight industries have been completed and the work on a number of others is in hand. Further consideration of these projects, including petro-chemical products, should yield concrete results within the next few months.

Similarly, substantial progress appears to have been made in the field of shipping. The R.C.D. Shipping Service with its headquarters at Istanbul is expected to commence operations from the 1st of April this year. This is an outstanding achievement which marks the success of our procedures for joint consultations and cooperation. I am confident that the Committee on Shipping would move on to the next phase which is the establishment of a Joint Maritime Company.

Banking and insurance services also appear to have rounded the corner with the commencement of the Insurance Centre in Karachi. In the important field of Re-insurance, firm decisions have been taken on the creation of Re-Insurance pools.

The multifarious advances we have made are reflected in the further strengthening of the R.C.D. Secretariat which has now been put on a business-like footing. The Secretariat has an important function to perform as the central coordinating agency for all R.C.D. activities.

These are encouraging developments which reinforce our confidence in our common efforts and the future of the R.C.D.

Before I conclude I wish to express to Your Excellencies and to the distinguished members of your delegations my grateful thanks for the kindness and unfailing courtesy I have received throughout, which has made my task as Chairman so pleasant. I would also like to thank the able Secretary-General and his hard-working staff for their contribution to the success of this session.

Opening Statement at the Fifth Meeting of R.C.D. Ministerial Council at Tehran on May 20, 1966

Mr. Chairman, Excellencies and Distinguished Delegates,

May I, at the outset, convey on behalf of my delegation and on my own behalf, our profound gratitude to His Imperial Majesty the Shahinshah Aryamehr for his gracious message of hope and confidence, which was read out to us by His Excellency Mr. Hussain Ghods Nakhai, Imperial Minister of Court. The message has reinforced our abiding faith in RCD and its future.

We are also grateful to you, Mr. Prime Minister, for your warm welcome and inspiring address. I wish to express to our host, the Imperial Iranian Government, our deep appreciation and grateful thanks for the generous hospitalities and courtesies extended to us, which, indeed, are symptomatic of the most brotherly feeling and love existing between the peoples of our three countries. For me personally, it has been a great honour and privilege to have been closely associated with RCD since its very inception and to have participated in its constructive and fruitful activities and watched it grow from strength to strength. I am very happy to take part in the fifth meeting of the RCD Ministerial Council in Tehran, a beautiful city indeed, which is an amalgam of the rich cultural traditions of the orient and the conveniences of the West.

Mr. Chairman, in the world of today, regional co-operation as an instrument for accelerating the pace of economic development has gained universal acceptance. For Iran, Pakistan and Turkey, RCD has special significance in more than one sense. The peoples of our three countries who share a common culture and faith, and are linked by historical ties and age-old traditions, have found in RCD an organizational expression for fruitful co-operation in economic and cultural fields. RCD has opened up vast vistas of fruitful cooperation through trade and joint-purpose enterprizes. Indeed their historical ties and common cultural heritage have

provided a solid foundation and have served to give their concerted efforts in RCD a new meaning and purposeful direction towards fulfilling the aspirations of our peoples for a better and fuller life.

Mr. Chairman, we are developing countries. Our needs and requirements are more or less the same, and so are our goals. We have to harness our available resources to the best advantage so that we can provide a decent living to our peoples. Individually all the three countries have undertaken well-measured programmes for their economic and social well-being. RCD represents our collective concerted efforts for promoting development on a regional basis; such development if undertaken on a national basis would either be an uneconomic or an impractical proposition. Heavy and sophisticated industries with all their complexities require enormous resources in capital and know-how and these we cannot individually provide except at an uneconomic cost. If we, however, pool our resources together, we can build up an industrial edifice which is at once economically viable and socially desirable. The 150 million people who inhabit our three countries provide an assured market for any industry that we may set up through our joint efforts under aegis of RCD.

Now, Mr. Chairman, a word about joint purpose enterprizes which are really the essence of our cooperation in the economic field. It is here that we put to test the efficacy of our Organization. It is here that we get away from a purely narrow and parochial approach to one which is broad and imaginative, and which takes into account the wider, the larger and the long-term interest of the region, albeit even at the prospect of a measure of immediate self-denial. The world today recognizes fewer economic boundaries. All over the stress now is on specialization and the establishment of large and economic units. Yet, Mr. Chairman, there are literally enormous vistas for promoting extremely fruitful cooperation in the industrial sphere. Well, Mr. Chairman, it is indeed most gratifying that we have moved forward in this sector rationally and objectively, and without haste or hesitation; that while dealing with the matter in a business-like fashion we have striven to preserve the RCD spirit. I can only hope and pray that in our future activity we will always remember that sometime it is more blessed to give than to receive.

We sincerely hope and believe that RCD will not only serve its members but will serve the entire region. It may even serve, by example of its tangible achievements, as a model to others which may wish to emulate its example. After all, there is keen desire on the part of the under-developed or more appropriately developing countries to develop themselves as expeditiously as possible so that they can make good for centuries' loss or neglect they have suffered for diverse reasons. That is why the door of RCD has been kept open for other regional countries to join it if they so desire and are

willing to accept and abide by the philosophy and spirit of RCD. Indeed, RCD will help achieve economic development and economic integration not only on national but also on regional basis and will thereby serve the cause of peace and stability for the entire region. Mr. Chairman, in the world of today, peace and progress are inseparable and peace can only be assured if we can ensure progress and development and the well-being of our masses.

The people of Pakistan are, therefore, proud to have been associated as partners with their Iranian and Turkish brethren in this great enterprize to build up a better future for all. They are confident that under the guidance of their wise and dynamic leaders they will achieve the high objectives of RCD. RCD has indeed ushered in new hopes and aspirations in our peoples who have always looked across their frontiers to work hand in hand with like-minded nations who shared with them a common Faith and a common Destiny.

RCD, therefore, represents at once a challenge and a trust, a challenge to our leadership and planners to fulfil the hopes of our peoples for a better and fuller life, and a trust because our peoples believe that their sagacious leadership should be able to satisfy their aspirations.

The Government of Pakistan has unflinching faith in RCD and its future. It is determined to work in closest co-operation and with complete understanding with the Governments of Iran and Turkey to realize the high objectives of RCD set forth by their illustrious Heads of State in the Joint Istanbul Statement on July 21, 1964. Pakistan will work unremittingly and with firm resolution towards achieving these objectives with the fullest co-operation and understanding of its partners, Iran and Turkey.

A period of some twenty-two months has elapsed since RCD was founded in Istanbul. This is a short period in the life of any organization. However, within this brief period I am glad to note that RCD has made significant progress and produced tangible results with promise of many more to come in the near future. In the field of joint-purpose enterprizes three large industrial projects of aluminium, carbon black and bank note paper have been worked out in detail and approved for implementation on a joint-equity-participation-sharing basis. In addition agreement has been reached for exchange of petrochemical products running into millions of dollars and covering important items such as synthetic rubber, synthetic fibres and vital chemicals for industrial use. Studies on quite a few industries, such as locomotives and pulp and paper, which have been identified for development on a joint-purpose-enterprize basis have been completed and would be considered by expert groups in early August this year. Yet detailed studies on further groups of heavy industries such as diesel engines, shipbuilding,

electrical goods, textile machinery, machinery and equipment for few industries and quite a few for others, would be completed by the end of September or early October this year and considered by expert groups in the first half of November. All this is indicative of the fact that all the three countries are taking their RCD obligations seriously. Intra-regional trade too continues to increase, although here I dare say we could do much more. I am glad to note that efforts are being made to evolve a satisfactory payments mechanism for promoting intra-regional trade, and that other obstacles impeding the growth of trade are being studied with a view to removing them. The RCD Shipping Service would be operating very soon. RCD Re-insurance Pools are being set up in the three countries and the RCD Insurance Centre and RCD Chamber of Commerce and Industry are now going concerns. The substantial reduction in rates of surface mail and telecommunications will facilitate communication amongst the peoples of the region and thus promote better understanding amongst them. The Regional Cultural Institute which we expect will commence practical operations within a fortnight or so would promote a closer understanding of the common cultural heritage of the three countries. The programmes of technical and cultural co-operation have got to a good start and would promote the objectives of RCD. These instances are illustrative of the positive progress made by RCD. Indeed, activities of RCD are gathering momentum every day and from the relatively simpler fields they have now moved to more complex and sophisticated fields. These concrete achievements are not ends in themselves, but are pointers in the direction of more and fruitful co-operation for the common good of the economics of the three countries for the greatest good of their peoples. In fact our co-operation should create the desired complimentarity in the economies of our respective countries.

We wish to convey our warm appreciation for the useful work done by the Regional Planning Council and its Coordination Committee, and the various committees and subcommittees. It is their hard and thorough work and pains-taking efforts which have ensured smooth and satisfactory progress of RCD.

Before I conclude I also wish to convey our felicitations to the Secretary-General and his staff, who have assisted and contributed substantially towards the preparations for this meeting.

Once again, Mr. Chairman, I wish to re-affirm that Pakistan is conscious of the great significance of our enterprize in RCD and I assure you that my Government and the people of Pakistan will work in closest co-operation and with fullest understanding with the Governments and the peoples of Iran and Turkey toward building a worthy edifice on the foundation laid by our three Heads of State in Istanbul in July 1964.

Closing Statement at the Fifth Meeting of R.C.D. Ministerial Council at Tehran on May 21, 1966

Mr. Chairman, Excellencies and Distinguished Delegates,

The fifth Ministerial Council meeting, which is about to conclude, will be rightly regarded as yet another milestone in the progress of RCD. The most significant decision in this session is that relating to the setting up of as many as three joint projects about bank note paper, aluminium and carbon black. We are confident that the joint-purpose enterprizes in these and numerous other fields identified will lead to purposeful and fruitful collaboration among the three countries, bringing substantial benefit to our peoples. We have also noted with satisfaction that steady progress has been maintained in the fields of cultural cooperation, trade, communications, roads, post and telegraph, petroleum and other fields. All these augur well for the future of RCD. Indeed, RCD symbolizes the close understanding and fraternal ties amongst the three countries. It is representative of our concerted efforts in ameliorating the living conditions of our peoples by planned development in economic and cultural fields.

The concrete achievements in these various fields in RCD are indicative of the positive role RCD is destined to play in harmonizing and integrating the economies of the three countries for the common good of our people. My Government attaches the highest importance to RCD activities.

The completely free and frank exchange of views in an atmosphere of utmost sincerity and cordiality, which characterized our meeting, symbolizes the spirit of RCD and accounts for the smooth, tangible and remarkable progress we have made in RCD in such a short period.

While we congratulate ourselves for the substantial progress in various fields, we are fully conscious of the great expectations of our people to ensure for them a better and fuller life. In certain fields where progress has not

been as rapid as we desired, we shall continue to make special efforts so that we can fully implement the mandate given to us by the three illustrious Heads of State in the Istanbul Joint Statement of July 21, 1964. We are confident that having overcome the initial organization and procedural difficulties, we would now proceed with efficiency and despatch.

Mr. Chairman, before I conclude I wish to convey my warm gratitude to you for your inspiring chairmanship and the excellent fashion in which you have conducted our deliberations. Indeed, your patience, tact and constructive guidance have contributed substantially to the smooth and fruitful deliberations in our meetings.

I would like to place on record my deep appreciation for the valuable work done by the Regional Planning Council under the chairmanship of H.E. Javad Mansour, the Head of the Iranian Delegation to the Planning Council. I would also like to convey the thanks of my delegation to the committees and subcommittees who have worked most sincerely and devotedly to ensure this substantial progress in the various fields. I feel equally happy to say that the RCD Secretariat under the leadership of its distinguished Secretary General has lived up to the expectations of the member governments and I am sure that as it gathers more experience, it would mature into a very useful institution and play an important role in promoting RCD objectives.

I would like to express my grateful thanks to His Excellency Mr. Amir Abbas Hoveyda, the Prime Minister of Iran, who very kindly inaugurated this session. Above all, may I express on behalf of my delegation and on my own behalf our profound gratitude to His Imperial Majesty the Shahinshah whose inspiring message was a beacon of light to guide all of us in our deliberations.

Last but not the least, I wish to convey our sincere thanks to our host the Imperial Iranian Government for the gracious hospitalities and warm courtesies extended to us all.

PART VII

PRESS STATEMENTS

Press Statement on Sacrilege Committed at Hazratbal Shrine in Srinagar on December 30, 1963

I have no words to express sense of pain and outrage felt by the hundred million people of Pakistan at the heinous crime of theft of the sacred Moo-i-Mubarak from the Hazaratbal Shrine in Srinagar.

Such a dastardly attack through theft of the most profoundly cherished possession of the religious sentiments of the Muslims of Kashmir and indeed of the entire Muslim world, as also the attempt to burn down the Muslim Shrine in Kishtwar, could not have taken place in Kashmir which is a Muslim majority area but for the climate created and sustained by the Government of India's evil policy of suppressing human rights of the people of Kashmir.

It is this climate which has emboldened criminal elements in India and now in Occupied Kashmir to let loose violence and terror against helpless Muslim population groaning under Indian rule. It is this climate in which the political, religious or cultural rights of the people are treated by the rulers with scorn, that has made possible the act of sacrilege and vandalism in the Hazratbal Shrine. It may well be that such organized attacks are being permitted by the Indian Occupation Authorities and their puppets as a part of India's plan to reduce the Muslim majority in Jammu and Kashmir to a minority by bringing home to its Muslim population a feeling that the lives, honour and religion of the Muslims are not safe, and that therefore they must leave their State.

The people of Kashmir do not stand alone in their hour of suffering and trial. The people of Pakistan share their sorrow and pain. In this moment of ordeal I re-affirm in the name of the people of Pakistan our solidarity with the victims of Indian oppression and outrage in Jammu and Kashmir.

The Muslims of Jammu and Kashmir will, I have no doubt, emerge from the agony of Hazratbal with an even greater determination to hasten the day of their deliverance from Indian oppression.

Press Statement on Kashmir Dispute in Karachi on February 19, 1964

You will recall that in my letter of January 16 addressed to the President of the Security Council, in the name of the Government of Pakistan, I had requested that an urgent meeting of the Council be convened to consider the grave and new situation that had arisen in the State of Kashmir.

This new situation, on the basis of impartial foreign eye-witness accounts, was that of an open rebellion against the State Government run by India's proteges and also against India itself.

The theft of the Holy Relic was the spark which ignited the smouldering discontent and opposition of the people of Jammu and Kashmir to the policy followed by the Government of India since 1947 of violating the right to self-determination of the people of Kashmir as embodied in an international agreement between India and Pakistan under the aegis of the Security Council, namely the UNCIP Resolutions of 13 August 1948 and 5 January 1949.

I need not, at this stage, go into the history of the violation of this basic, fundamental right of the people of Kashmir. It would suffice to say that the further measures of annexation which Bakhshi Ghulam Muhammad announced on October 3, 1963 followed by the statement by Mr. Nanda to the Indian Parliament, drove the brave Kashmiri people to the point of open rebellion against India.

I asked for a Security Council meeting in order to consider this grave situation, to call upon India to stop these measures, and to devise ways and means of breaking the deadlock in the Kashmir dispute and move it towards a just and honourable solution.

In my letter of January 16, I had also informed the Security Council

of the repercussions of the theft or the sacred relic on the people of Pakistan and the communal frenzy which was let loose against the Muslim minority in Calcutta and West Bengal, and invited the Security Council's urgent attention to the task of finding a prompt settlement of the Kashmir dispute so that the impaired relations between India and Pakistan could be restored to normality, and impressed that, as a result, the minorities in the two countries would be assured of safety of life, liberty and honour.

The Security Council was convened on February 3 in pursuance of my request. I made a statement to the Council in amplification of my letter of January 16.

The Education Minister of India, in reply, said nothing new and repeated the same old arguments made by Indian representatives in the past, that Kashmir had become an integral part of India as a result of the Instrument of Accession executed by the feudal Maharaja of Kashmir in 1947; that there was no dispute; that Pakistan had no *locus standi;* that the UNCIP Resolutions had become obsolete and inoperative; that Pakistan was a theocratic state, while India was secular, democratic and enlightened.

He even went on to intimidate Members of the United Nations and more especially the new countries of Asia and Africa by condemning self-determination as a subversive principle which would spell danger to the unity and integrity of the new countries which comprise multi-racial and multilingual peoples.

Though the dispute between India and Pakistan pertains to the right to self-determination of the people of Jammu and Kashmir which India has continually violated since 1947, yet by these irrelevant and offensive allegations against Pakistan, Indian representatives have persistently sought to becloud and confuse the issue in the United Nations by raising matters which are not at all relevant to its solution which is to implement the right of self-determination.

In the circumstances, however, I had no option but to expose the falsity and the fictitious nature of the arguments put forward by Indian representatives and to persuade the Members of the Security Council to focus their attention, once again, on the central issue of the dispute over Kashmir.

It is my hope that as a result of the experience had in the last few weeks in New York, Indian representatives will desist from vilifying the good name of Pakistan whenever the question of Kashmir is discussed.

The overwhelming majority of the Council members affirmed in their statements that the right to self-determination of the people of Kashmir must be implemented and that the UNCIP resolutions stand valid. They rejected India's arguments that these resolutions had become obsolete or inoperative.

Several members called upon India to desist from aggravating the situation, that is, to desist from the measures of annexation which it has been steadily pursuing after pledging its honour in a solemn agreement to let the people of Kashmir decide their future freely.

Particularly heartening was the fact that the overwhelming majority of the members, and more especially the two newly independent states of Africa—Morocco and the Ivory Coast—affirmed in clear terms that the right to self-determination of the people of Kashmir can never become obsolete by passage of time or be rendered inoperative. This lead had a most heartening effect. Forthright statements in favour of self-determination were also made by the representatives of the United Kingdom, Norway, the United States of America, Brazil and other members of the Security Council.

For ten days the members of the Security Council made intensive efforts to formulate a consensus or an agreed statement of the views of the members of the Security Council.

Despite our preference for a resolution of the Security Council, which is the normal form of procedure adopted by the Council and other principal organs of the United Nations such as the General Assembly, we agreed to consider with an open mind this departure from standard practice when it was urged on us that in this way a veto by the Soviet Union would be avoided.

Four non-permanent members of the Security Council, namely, Morocco, the Ivory Coast, Norway and Brazil—the representative of the last country being the President of the Security Council for the month of February—presented to both India and Pakistan a draft consensus. After intensive and protracted negotiations, a text was evolved consisting of a preambular and an operative part.

In the preamble of the consensus, it was stated that the number of resolutions, adopted by the Security Council in the past, stand; that the majority of the members emphasised the belief that the provisions contained in these resolutions referring specially to the importance of ascertaining the will of the poeple are still the appropriate way to arrive at a final, peaceful and mutually agreeable settlement of the question. The Soviet view that the question of Kashmir had already been settled was also mentioned. Nevertheless, a renewed effort, it was considered, might yield more constructive results.

In the light of these considerations, the operative part of the text of the consensus recalled past resolutions of the United Nations and called upon the parties to refrain from any action likely to aggravate the situation, to restore peace and harmony between the communities, and to assure the safety of the minorities.

Furthermore, India and Pakistan were invited to resume the negotiations with a view to reaching a settlement of Jammu and Kashmir inspired by respect for the principles enshrined in the Charter of the United Nations; as well as in view of further related matters and to this end, it was suggested that the parties should jointly have recourse, whenever they may deem it appropriate, to the mediation of a country or a statesman of their choice, and that they should then confer with the Secretary-General to that end.

This consensus, as formulated on behalf of the Security Council and presented to the two sides on February 16, in our view, fell short of our minimum position, that is, to lay the frame-work of negotiations between India and Pakistan so that a solution of the dispute could be found on the basis of the will of the people.

The text of the operative part of the consensus no doubt stated that the Security Council recalled these resolutions. It was, however, necessary to state in the operative part that the parties should resume their negotiations in the spirit of respect for United Nations resolutions, the central provision of which stipulates that the future of the State of Jammu and Kashmir should be decided by the people of the state through an impartial plebiscite conducted under the auspices of the United Nations.

India remained adamantly opposed to negotiations within such a framework. The members of the Secuirty Council suggested various alternative texts to the two parties in this regard.

It became necessary for the Government of Pakistan to examine most carefully the precise and full implications of these alternative suggestions. More time was needed for consultations. In view of the visit of Premier Chou En-lai and Foreign Minister Chen Yi, it was also necessary for me to return to Pakistan. For this a short adjournment of the meeting of the Security Council was necessary to enable me to return to Pakistan.

The Security Council, acting under Rule 33 of its Provisional Rules of Procedure, at the request of Morocco, adjourned the meeting. The President of the Security Council made a statement that the Council remained seized of the Kashmir question.

It is now held by India that Pakistan would have to show "new cause" for reconvening the meeting on Kashmir. This contention is untenable. There has been no adjournment of the debate *sine die*. What has taken place is only an adjournment of the meeting of the Security Council.

The fact that I have returned to Pakistan for further consultations and for attending to the visit of the distinguished Chinese statesmen makes the adjournment of the Security Council no different from the adjournments of its meeting while I was in New York to enable behind-the-scene negotiations through the four non-permanent members to take place.

This is where the position rests at the moment. It is the Government of

Pakistan's intention to request the Council to continue the meeting after a few days.

If I may sum up the outcome to date of our reference of the Kashmir dispute to the Security Council, the following results have emerged:

1. There is a grave dispute between India and Pakistan over the State of Jammu and Kashmir, which is a threat to peace. All members of the Security Council have stated this.
2. The people of Kashmir are unreconciled to Indian rule and demand a plebiscite.
3. This dispute must be resolved in accordance with the right of the people of Jammu and Kashmir to self-determination.
4. The UNCIP resolutions cannot be repudiated by India unilaterally. They stand valid. India's contention that they are obsolete and have been rendered inoperative by the passage of time has been rejected.
5. India and Pakistan should resume negotiations preferably with the assistance of a third party to resolve the Kashmir dispute taking into account the will of the people.
6. Several delegations have urged that no unilateral steps be taken by either party in contravention of the provisions of the Security Council resolutions.
7. All members of the Security Council, including the Soviet Union, are anxious to avoid a veto, and are of the view that action should be taken by the Council by means of formulating a consensus, so as to make Pakistan and India resume negotiations with a view to arriving at a just and honourable settlement of the Kashmir dispute.

Until the draft consensus presented to the two parties is made to reflect these views of the members of the Security Council in an adequate manner, it will be a betrayal of the people of Kashmir for Pakistan to accept it.

Press Statement on Second African-Asian Conference in Karachi, on April 21, 1964

The preparatory meeting to consider necessary arrangements for a Second African-Asian Conference was held at Ministerial level in Djakarta from April 10 to 15, 1964. Twenty-two countries—thirteen from Asia and nine from Africa—were represented at the meeting. I had the honour to lead the Pakistan delegation to that meeting.

You will have seen the final communique of that meeting in which twenty-two Afro-Asian countries took part.

It has been decided to hold a Second African-Asian Conference in Africa from March 10, 1965 at the level of Heads of State/Government in an African capital. The venue will be selected by consultations between African states, members of the Organization of African Unity.

In regard to the question of timing, it was the general consensus of the twenty-two delegations which met in Djakarta that the Second African-Asian Conference should be held during the tenth anniversary year of the First African-Asian Conference which met in Bandung in April 1955.

Before the recent preparatory meeting in Djakarta, it was apprehended by a number of delegations including that of Pakistan that if the Second African Asian Conference was convened after the Second Non-Aligned Conference scheduled for October this year, the importance of and interest in the former may well be seriously diminished in view of the fact that a large number of African-Asian countries would have already participated in the Second Non-Aligned Conference and also because the items on the agenda of the two conferences would be, to a great extent, common to both. These delegations, therefore, had some misgivings that the Second African-Asian Conference may to some extent turn out to be a duplication of the Second

Non-Aligned Conference.

As a result of the intensive consultations and exchange of views which took place in the preparatory meeting in Djakarta among the twenty-two delegations, it was found that these fears and misgivings were groundless. The overwhelming majority of the representatives of the twenty-two African-Asian countries reached the conclusion that the Second Non-Aligned Conference could not be a substitute for a Second African-Asian Conference and that the two congresses would be quite different both in their political character and scope. Whereas the Second Non-Aligned Conference would be primarily concerned with an appraisal of the role of non-aligned countries in the radically changed conditions of the world since 1961 when the First Non-Aligned Conference was held, the aims and objectives of the Second African-Asian Conference would be to further strengthen and develop African-Asian solidarity and to promote the struggle of the people of Asia and Africa against imperialism, colonialism and neo-colonialism until their last vestiges are eradicated.

It was also the general consensus of opinion of almost all of us who met in Djakarta that whereas the role of the non-aligned countries as such had greatly diminished in a world in which the cold war had been practically eliminated, the need for the development of African-Asian solidarity as a world force had on the other hand become even greater. Therefore the Second Non-Aligned Conference, even if held earlier, could not derogate from the historic importance of and interest in a Second African-Asian Conference.

The tenth anniversary of the First African-Asian Conference falls in April 1965. However, in order to accommodate Pakistan, the preparatory meeting in Djakarta decided to fix the date of the Second African-Asian Conference a few weeks earlier, on March 10.

In view of the historic significance of the Second African-Asian Conference, adequate and thorough preparations will be necessary to make it, as all Asian-African countries wish to do, one of the greatest international congresses of our time.

The time element was also a very important factor in the decision to convene it next year. If the Conference was held this year and before the Second Non-Aligned Conference, there would have been no choice than to hold it in August or September and in between a number of summit conferences of the African and Arab States and the Second Non-Aligned Conference scheduled in October. In that event, it would have become extremely difficult for a large number of Heads of State and Government of Asia and Africa to participate in the Second African-Asian Conference. By holding it next year instead, the preparatory meeting has ensured, as far as possible, the universality of representation at the summit level of more

than sixty Asian-African countries; thus, assuring the event of a momentous importance of its own.

In regard to the agenda of the Second African-Asian Conference, the preparatory meeting in Djakarta accepted as the basic working paper the proposals of Pakistan delegation in this regard. The Joint Communique sets forth agenda of the Second African-Asian Conference as approved by the preparatory meeting. The people of Pakistan will, no doubt, note with special interest the items relating to genocide and the strengthening of the United Nations through the implementation of its resolutions by its members. These two items are of the most direct, immediate and over-riding importance.

It will be further noted that among the objectives of the Second African-Asian Conference as set forth in the final communique of April 15, there is the provision for peaceful settlement of disputes and renunciation of the threat or use of force; for securing the restoration of lawful rights of domicile to populations evicted from their ancestral homes as a result of imperialist and colonialist designs; and for inviolability of human rights.

It is not necessary for me to elaborate on these matters. As for the latter provision, it seems to me that it is wide enough to include the question of forcible eviction by India of its Muslim nationals from West Bengal, Assam and Tripura. Therefore, the objectives as well as the provisional agenda of the Second Asian-African Conference have been so formulated that Pakistan will be enabled to seek, if considered desirable or necessary, the assistance of the entire African-Asian world in finding solutions and adjustments of disputes and differences with India, which have so far placed the peace and stability of this region in danger and also undermined African-Asian solidarity.

In this context, I should like to pay tribute to the delegation of Indonesia for having proposed for inclusion in the provisional agenda of the Second African-Asian Conference sub-item entitled "Basic Principles for the Settlement of African-Asian Disputes". This finds a place under item 5 of the provisional agenda.

In my address to the plenary session of the preparatory meeting on April 11, I stressed the urgency of promoting the economic development of the African-Asian regions and suggested that the Second African-Asian Conference must undertake an appraisal of the results of the Geneva Conference on World Trade and Development and consider what steps should be taken to find solutions to the basic problems of the African-Asian countries. I further recommended that experts from African-Asian countries may under take this examination even before the Second African-Asian Conference.

It is gratifying that our proposals in this regard were given serious consideration by the preparatory meeting and the final communique provided

that the Governments of the countries invited to the Second African-Asian Conference and also represented in the U.N. Conference on Trade and Development might instruct their heads of delegation in Geneva to meet at the end of the U.N. Conference and to review and evaluate its results in the light of the provisional agenda of the Second African-Asian Conference with a view to formulating recommendations on economic problems.

African-Asian countries not represented in the U.N. Conference, like People's Republic of China, may also be invited to participate in such a meeting. Furthermore, the preparatory meeting decided to hold a meeting of Foreign Ministers of participating countries immediately before and in conjunction with the Second African-Asian Conference. This meeting will pay special attention to the question of economic development and co-operation of African-Asian countries.

The question of the composition of the Second African-Asian Conference turned out to be the most thorny and controversial of all the matters that the preparatory meeting in Djakarta had to decide. The view of Pakistan that invitations should be extended to all the twenty-nine Asian-African countries which had participated in the Bandung Conference for 1955 as well as to all other African-Asian states which have become independent since that time, found unanimous acceptance. It was also decided that countries in Asia and Africa which will become independent between now and the convening of the Second African-Asian Conference should have the right to participate. Another proposal that representatives of all national freedom movements in African-Asian countries which had not yet attained independence, should have the right to be heard at the Second African-Asian Conference was adopted without opposition.

However, serious conflict of opinion arose over India's proposal to invite the Soviet Union to the Second African-Asian Conference and also over the question of inviting Malaysia.

In regard to the first, India's demand that the Soviet Union be invited took the preparatory meeting in Djakarta by complete surprise. Apparently, the Government of India had obtained the approval of the Soviet Union to the proposal and took only the delegation of Ceylon into confidence on this matter. A majority of the delegations represented at the preparatory meeting felt that while the Soviet Union was a World Power and had greatly assisted and supported the struggle of African-Asian countries against imperialism and colonialism, it, with its capital in Moscow, and being essentially a European power, could not be considered by any criteria as an Asian Power.

There was also fear among these delegations that if the Soviet Union were invited, the Second African-Asian Conference might well become a cockpit of the Sino-Soviet conflict instead of a forum for the consolidation and further development of African-Asian solidarity.

Several delegations expressed their resentment over the fact that they were being faced with a situation in which they were compelled to oppose an invitation to the Soviet Union with the consequent embarrassment that would be entailed in their relations with that Great Power.

As there was no consensus on this matter and as the rules of procedure discouraged resort to a vote, no agreement could be reached on the question of inviting the Soviet Union to participate in Second African-Asian Conference and therefore the Indian proposal was rejected.

In regard to Malaysia, the Indonesian view that an invitation to Malaysia should be postponed until after the Malaysian elections scheduled for April 25 and the tripartite discussions between Malaysia, the Philippines and Indonesia for a settlement of their differences had been held, found general acceptance. The Pakistan delegation made it clear that it recognized Malaysia which was a member of the United Nations and a fellow-member of the Commonwealth and was in favour of extending an invitation to that country as soon as possible to participate in the Second African-Asian Conference.

I have come back from Djakarta profoundly impressed with the strength of African-Asian solidarity and the enthusiasm and determination of the African-Asian countries, which participated in the preparatory meeting, to make the Second African-Asian Conference one of the greatest international congresses of our time.

The President, the Government and the people of Indonesia deserve our gratitude for the unremitting efforts that they have been making since 1956 to bring about a Second African Asian Conference. Pakistan has, since 1960, extended its solid support and collaboration to Indonesia's efforts to this end. Our nation can, therefore, take legitimate satisfaction that the patient efforts of the Governments of Pakistan and Indonesia have been crowned with success.

The nations of Asia and Africa have emerged from the dark night of colonialism and imperialism, and are motivated by constructive and positive aims in their efforts to promote their solidarity. Ours is no counsel of exclusiveness. We do not seek domination; neither do we seek to promote the segregation of the two continents from the rest of the world. as I said in my statement to the plenary session of the preparatory meeting on April 11: "Africa and Asia beckon to all nations and all peoples of the world to choose equality and flee greed, to practise tolerance and turn from hate, to bury animosity and embrace brotherhood".

Press Statement on Arms Aid to India, on November 14, 1964

Even before the border clash between China and India in October 1962, it was becoming increasingly clear that, in the wake of the withdrawal of colonial empires from this part of the world, the Western powers wanted to make India their main bulwark in Asia. It was also clear that India herself had similar motions about her chosen destiny. The outer limits of India's geo-political hegemony were fully propounded by Pannikar.

It is almost two years now since we came face to face with the situation arising out of Western arms aid to India. We have been told time and again that this aid is limited in character and has for its sole object a containment of Chinese threat to India.

In actual fact there seems little doubt that the Sino-Indian conflict merely provided the opportunity and the psychological atmosphere in which India became not only receptive but eager for Western support.

As far as the donors were concerned, their desire to neutralise Asia, from their point of view, by creating an Asian big power with sufficient vested interest, preceded any consideration for India's defence. The essence of the idea was to put a big India against a big China.

It is necessarily an over-simplification, but it cannot be denied that the single most important factor in relations between Asia and the West is the differential in their standards of living and the resultant concern of the industrialized countries, lest, with the removal of the colonial yoke, the over-powering masses of Asia should upset the apple-cart by demanding too much too soon to make up for nearly two hundred years of almost total exclusion from the fruits of the industrial revolution.

A substitute had to be found particularly when communism threatened

to provide the answer. In looking for a substitute, India and Pakistan, by virtue of their relative socio-economic superiority, became the obvious choice. Pakistan under the then leadership fell in with this design whereas the ambitious Nehru kept them at bay for a while. He held out to extract the maximum benefit from both power blocs and adopted an independent posture. Pandit Nehru was not averse to aid but he insisted and succeeded in getting aid on India's terms.

His ideas of the role of neutralism and the grand design for an upsurge of the Afro-Asian world under an Indian hegemony broke at the seams before it could get properly under way, largely due to his one blind spot which prevented him from appreciating the need for a friendly and co-operative Pakistan.

China seemed to have grasped the true nature of India's ambitions. Even at the height of her friendly relations with India she refused to commit herself on Kashmir and kept the door open for developing closer relations with Pakistan.

China's distrust of Nehru began to take tangible form with his political excursions into the regions of the Himalayas. Then came October 1962, which will remain the single greatest blunder of an ambitious man gone senile and, on the rebound, India fell into the eager arms of the Western world. If critics have found this theory to be too cynical, our experience during the two years that have followed October, 1962 should have set their doubts at rest. Only recently Senator Humphrey, who is now the US Vice-President-elect, has gone even one step further and spelled it out so cleary as to leave no room for any further doubt. He said:

> "The only real counter-balance to the Chinese power is a coalition of Powers with India as its main force. In looking at Asia we should always consider the role of India, what we expect from her and what she can provide.
>
> "It is important to consider how India with her 400 million inhabitants, can be saved from chaos and made strong enough to exercise leadership in the area.
>
> "To compare aid to India with aid to smaller Asian countries, is like comparing the street repair bill of New York city with Debuque, Iowa."

This not only reads like Pannikar but it confirms an identity of interests. A situation of massive confrontation among Asian powers would keep things balanced and leave the rest of world reasonably free from pressure to follow economic and political policies.

India is prepared to lend herself to this grand design in the hope that she would enjoy advantages over the rest of Asia and Africa and be able to realize her own hegemony within this context.

This is the background which explains both the motivations and the

compulsions of Western aid to India in general and arms aid in particular. In formulating our policy against this development we have to take precise measures.

For the present the greatest single anomaly appears to be that whereas the realization of India's hegemony is dependent on the success with which the other countries in the area can be made to submit either by persuasion or by the sheer force of preponderant power, the actual steps being taken by certain countries to strengthen India are causing a proportionate reaction among her smaller neighbours and increasing both their resentment to the idea of Indian supremacy as also their determination to resist such a development.

We have attempted to persuade Western powers to realize the consequences of their policy which would force smaller nations in the area to seek support from elsewhere to reinforce their security.

We would have to proceed with utmost caution and deliberation to decide what concrete steps we should take in the field of diplomacy. These steps should be carefully worked out so that they remain consistent with our need for security.

We should in this context ensure against a reactionary tendency. We would need to move on two levels—bilaterally and multilaterally in the United Nations and the Afro-Asian circles where we could progressively manifest our just cause. In order to do this effectively we would need to draw up a Master Plan on the basis of our national interest, regional interests and the interests of world peace.

As a corollary to this exercise for drawing up a Master Plan, it would be necessary to undertake planning with a view to mobilising the human and material resources of the country in such a manner as to provide us with the greatest possible strength within the shortest possible time.

Having drawn up these plans, we could then proceed to execute them in a pragmatic fashion according to the need of a particular situation.

This way, each action on our part would not only meet the diplomatic requirements of a given situation but it would also be a step towards the realization of a pre-determined and comprehensive set of objectives.

Press Statement on Congo Situation on November 29, 1964

Recent developments in the Congo have caused grave concern in Pakistan. We are surprised at the action taken by the Belgian Government in landing their paratroops in Stanleyville and precipitating a tragedy which might well have been averted if patient efforts had been made to search for a peaceful solution of the difficulties faced by some foreigners resident in Stanleyville.

It is our view that negotiations for the repatriation of these civilians should have been carried through the International Red Cross, who, we understand, were about to send a mission to Stanleyville for this purpose.

The recent actions of some powers in the Congo have roused resentment in a large number of African nations and have scarcely helped to serve the interests of peace.

We earnestly hope that all foreign troops would be immediately withdrawn from the Congo and those who are sincerely desirous of restoring peace and tranquillity to the people of the Congo would devote themselves entirely to the task of seeking a solution of the existing problems by peaceful means, in close consultation with the leaders of the African nations.

Press Statement on Foreign-Tour Impressions and Indian Duplicity, in Karachi on February 3, 1965

In the course of my tour I visited the Soviet Union, the Federal Republic of Germany, United Kingdom, the United States and France. I availed of this opportunity to hold discussions with their leaders regarding the world situation in general and the situation in our region in particular.

I impressed upon the leaders of the Soviet Union and the United States in particular the concern of developing countries over the crisis in the United Nations with regard to Article 19. I reiterated Pakistan's position in the course of my statement before the General Assembly in which I stressed the desire of all the developing nations to avert the crisis which could not but impair the prestige and effectiveness of the United Nations Organization.

It is imperative in the larger interest of our times that the United Nations should not only survive but grow from strength to strength. Unless this is ensured, there would be no other alternative but for world affairs to get increasingly polarized both on lines of geographical and ideological affinities. This would lead to an entirely new situation, and open up possibilities whose nature and magnitude we are at present not in a position to estimate.

I brought to the attention of both the United Nations General Assembly and also the leaders of the countries which I visited, the developments in our region with Indian leaders bent upon adding tension to tension.

I drew their particular attention to the dangerous proposal of Mr. Shastri for a nuclear shield for India. It was gratifying to find a large measure of understanding, and I feel confident that this proposal will not find the support which Mr. Shastri might have desired.

In the United Nations the Indian representative once again attempted to mislead the world by claiming that Jammu and Kashmir was an integral part of India. The United Nations, however, is fully aware of Indian duplicity and not entirely unfamiliar with the extent to which India can resort to facile epithets in order to cover the true nature of her intentions not only towards Pakistan but towards her other neighbours.

We do not wish to appear as the architects of India's declining stature in the affairs of the world, but it is with some amazement that I look upon the complasence with which Indian leaders ignore the sentiments of the people of Asia and Africa. They would still like to feel that the world is gullible enough to accept them on their face value notwithstanding all their duplicity and in spite of their double alignment and double standards.

It is high time that the leaders of India recognized reality and if not in the interest of justice and fair play at least in their own interest proceed to mend their ways. We have always advocated peace and tranquillity. We have never ceased to recognize the imperative need of friendship with our neighbours and especially with India.

The merits of our stand are recognized universally and beyond any shadow of doubt. The question is: Will Indian leadership continue to turn a blind eye to all the writings on the wall in their senseless obsession to ride rough-shod over the legitimate rights and aspirations of all other peoples?

It was a solemn and a great historic occasion, and for me it was a privilege to represent the Government and people of Pakistan at the funeral ceremony of the late Sir Winston Churchill. With his passing away we have reached the end of an era which history will undoubtedly refer to as the age of Winston Churchill.

He left such an indelible mark on his times and showed such outstanding qualities of courage and determination that we can maintain with certainty that future generations will draw inspiration from his life for a long time to come.

No single man has done more for his country than Winston Churchill did for. Britain He will rate with the greatest of the great leaders of mankind in the annals of recorded history.

Account of the Press Statement in Moscow on Pakistan-Soviet Relationship, on April 5, 1965

A new chapter has already been opened in the Pakistan-Soviet relationship as a result of President Ayub's visit to Russia. The talks have been held in a friendly spirit and cordial atmosphere. The trend has been so satisfactory that it would not be unreasonable to hope that the two countries would concur even on those problems on which they had differences. In fact there are good prospects of a lasting agreement in the near future.

The talks covered the whole range of international problems with particular emphasis on areas of tension which find greatest accentuation in South Vietnam. Kashmir was also discussed.

We discussed all matters and issues on which we agree and also those on which there is lack of agreement.

Pakistan believes in and subscribes to the principle of peaceful co-existence, then Bandung principles, complete and general disarmament and total liquidation of colonialism irrespective of its texture—white or brown.

The Soviet Union too, is devoted to these principles, and the areas of agreement between the two countries could give depth and dimension to their mutual understanding and also help remove the areas of disagreement.

Statement on the Re-arrest of Shaikh Abdullah, on May 8, 1965

This country has received the news of the re-arrest of Shaikh Abdullah and Mirza Afzal Beg with a deep sense of shock and anger. Thus, for the third time, this valiant fighter for freedom has been put behind the prison walls to still the voice of Jammu and Kashmir and to crush the struggle for its freedom. Little does the Government of India seem to realize that there is no hardship that they can impose on Shaikh Abdullah and his people, which can break their spirit or diminish their resolve to march forward in their struggle for independence from the tutelage of India, which has been hoisted on them by the force of arms.

This ruthless Indian action comes at a time when Indian aggressiveness in the Rann of Kutch has brought Pakistan and India to the verge of war. The armed forces of India are massed all along our borders. Pakistan forces stand poised to defend the territory of this nation and to repulse aggression. By its ruthless and unlawful action against Shaikh Abdullah and his companions, at this moment of grave crisis, the Indian Government has taken another step towards the point of no return.

We have always maintained that all Indo-Pakistan difficulties derive their origin from the Jammu and Kashmir dispute. In the sequence of events, considering only the most recent occurrences whether it is the fight in the Rann of Kutch or the Indian thrust at Dahagram or their ruthless explusion of hundreds and thousands of Indian Muslims, the cause is one and the same—the continuation of the Indo-Pakistan dispute over Jammu and Kashmir. The Government of India, by arresting Shaikh Abdullah have sufficiently demonstrated the validity of our contention.

Shaikh Abdullah was freed from jail; he was even allowed to go abroad.

Why did then India place him under arrest the moment he touched down at Palam Airport? It was because he is the leader of the struggle of the people of Jammu and Kashmir for their liberation, and as such he symbolizes the very heart and crux of the problems that bedevil relations between Pakistan and India. By arresting him they have put their crest and seal on the fact that every single situation that causes tension and strife between the two countries can be traced right back and directly to the question of the future of Jammu and Kashmir.

Mr Shastri told his countrymen the other day that they stood at the crossroads of history. Through wilfulness or lack of will his Government seems destined to take the wrong turning, even at these last stages, on the road to disaster.

For eighteen years of its uneasy co-existence with India, Pakistan has made every effort to lay the foundation of a relationship based on justice, honour and mutual respect. We have put up with India's over-bearing ways, her constant efforts to isolate Pakistan in the world and to damage and usurp our rights and interests and to undermine Pakistan's very existence and independence. Today, in the Rann of Kutch, we have halted the latest of such attempts made by India with the use of its armed forces, only to be threatened with a trial of strength along our borders at a place of India's choosing.

India's leaders have shown that they are deaf to the voice of reason, oblivious to the precepts of peace and honour among nations, blind to the perils which, in their confusion and obstinacy, they will surely bring upon all the peoples of this region.

I would say to the people of Pakistan and to our brethren in Jammu and Kashmir that although Shaikh Abdullah and Mirza Afzal Beg have gone behind the cold walls of prison again, and I know that in the heart of everyone of you today there is anger and indignation, yet the days of anger and indignation are over.

The violence done to Shaikh Abdullah's liberty is a challenge to the very principle on which this country is founded, the principle that every people have a right to determine their own future in full freedom and liberty. We have to act now with cold determination to meet this challenge and put an end, once and for all, to the neo-colonialist Indian usurpation and tyranny.

Shaikh Abdullah will be sustained in this hour of his ordeal by the knowledge that he has the united resolve of his own people and the hundred million people of Pakistan to carry on from where he was so callously forced by the Government of India to leave. He would also have the goodwill and support of Afro-Asian countries and the sympathy of lovers of freedom and justice all over the world.

Since India has chosen the path of perpetual animosity with Pakistan, she will have to learn that Pakistan can be as unflinching in the defence of its rights and its honour as it has been steadfast in the pursuit of a peace based on justice.

At this moment of anguish and ordeal, the Pakistani nation must finally dedicate itself to the cause for which Shaikh Abdullah stands, the liberation of the people of Jammu and Kashmir.

Let us now ponder afresh at the teachings of Islam, which make it incumbent on every Muslim to wage war against tyranny and oppression. We remain steadfast in our desire for peace. As I said in London recently, let India leave her trenches and tanks and come to the negotiation table. Let us put our heads together in a sincere effort to resolve the question of Jammu and Kashmir and all other ancillary problems between the two countries. Let there be peace with justice and honour. But if India should be bent upon pursuing the path of war, a brave people have no other alternative but to face it.

Address to the Press Conference at New York on September 29, 1965

Good Morning, Ladies and Gentlemen,

Thank you very much for responding to our invitation. It is kind of you to take the trouble. You are aware of the Kashmir dispute. It has lingered on for eighteen years, the Security Council has so many documentations on it, so many resolutions on it, and you are familiar with the whole dispute. You are familiar with our position on the Kashmir dispute and you are aware of India's position on it. In a generation India and Pakistan have gone to war twice on the Kashmir dispute. This is a fundamental matter of principle on which Pakistan cannot surrender. Our position is that the right to self-determination of the people of Jammu and Kashmir is involved and that the right to self-determination in this case is sanctified by an international agreement to which India is a party. All we ask for is the implementation of an international agreement between India and Pakistan on the basis and principle of the right to self-determination which is embodied in that agreement and which is the corner-stone of the United Nations' Charter. I want to make it quite clear that we are not taking a rigid position; we are not taking a dogmatic and an unreasonable position. We are taking a position which is patently fair, which has been endorsed by history and which is the evolution and the greatest phenomenon of our own time—that is, the freedom and liberty of people. This is our position, and it is a reasonable one. It is a position to which India was itself a party too, and now it is difficult for the international community to allow India to wriggle out of her own commitments. I do not make a lengthy statement. Once again I want to thank all those countries that have participated in the Security Council's debate, taken all the trouble to try to settle this most important of all disputes that affects the continent of Asia. I am leaving tonight for Pakistan,

and I would like to thank the Press and every one else for the co-operation and understanding they have shown to a just and righteous cause which a small country like ours is defending against a clear and naked aggression which was inflicted on my country on the 6th of September.

Answers to Questions:

Answering a correspondent's question on the Pak-India relations the Foreign Minister said:

"This, I think, only goes to confirm our position. Our position is this that it is not enough to have a cease-fire. It is not enough to place all our emphasis and all our attention on getting a cease-fire. Cease-fire is only a means to an end. We must grapple with the problem itself, find a solution to the dispute of Jammu and Kashmir, otherwise, we had a cease-fire in the past and we had a war again. We can have another cease-fire, may be a cease-fire which brings about some lull, some temporary tranquillity, but it will not be the answer to the problem."

Answering another question on the subject the Foreign Minister said:

"I am not saying that there will be a war because we are not responsible for war. We were a victim of aggression before, we have been a victim of aggression again. How can we say that India will not resort to her habit of committing aggression against us again."

Answering another question the Foreign Minister said:

"I am not going to comment on other problems. Our position on the Jammu and Kashmir dispute is clear as I said that it is not a rigid or a dogmatic position. We have made our proposal *i.e.,* India and Pakistan should withdraw their troops from the State of Jammu and Kashmir. In making this proposal we are not imposing a liability on India or again, on ourselves. We say that Pakistan and India should be in an equal position. Neither we should have an advantage nor they should have an advantage. They should withdraw their troops from the disputed territory and we would be prepared to withdraw our troops from the disputed territory. Then a machinery should be formed so that the people of the State are given a free choice to decide their future."

Answering a further question the Foreign Minister said:

"Pakistan's soil is not a disputed territory. The territory in dispute is Jammu and Kashmir, and it is in Jammu and Kashmir alone that there should be a peace force to supervise a free and impartial plebiscite."

Answering a question on the stationing of a U.N. Force in the Jammu and Kashmir State, the Foreign Minister said:

"Oh yes, we will say that for the whole of the State of Jammu and Kashmir. We are willing to vacate our troops from the territory we hold and India should vacate its troops from the territory India holds."

Answering a question regarding the Kashmir dispute *vis-a-vis* the United Nations Organisation the Foreign Minister said:

"The question is that once before we placed all our hopes and aspirations for future destiny in the hands of the United Nations and for eighteen years the United Nations had this dispute on its lap. Now again there has been a fighting. Our people have made sacrifices and this is the second time that we have been called upon to place our future, our hopes, the hopes of our people in the hands of the Security Council and this is for the second time that we have done it. Now we will give the Security Council a reasonable opportunity—a reasonable opportunity to evolve a self-executing agreement for the settlement of the Jammu and Kashmir dispute. And if the Security Council moves forward, if it makes earnest, sincere and courageous efforts to find a solution which affects six hundred million people, we will extend the fullest co-operation to the Security Council and to all others who will assist in finding its lasting solution. But, if, on the other hand, we believe that we are returning to the old times and that once the cease-fire is brought about, things go back in the way they went back on the previous occasion, then of course we have a right to reconsider our position."

Answering a question regarding his views on an impartial plebiscite in Kashmir, the Foreign Minister observed:

"I would say that in principle it is essential that both India and Pakistan should not be in a position to affect and influence the decision of the people of Jammu and Kashmir. The machinery to replace them can be of the United Nations or any other impartial authority to ensure that a free and fair plebiscite is held."

Answering a question regarding Pakistan's co-operation with the Security Council, the Foreign Minister said:

"We have always obeyed the Security Council. We have always been the good boys in this. We have already co-operated with it. So the question of our disobeying does not arise if experience and precedent is any criterion of judging Pakistan's attitude. And we will extend the fullest co-operation to the Security Council. We will implement all, the entire resolution in its totality and the resolution does not concern that paragraph alone. It is a resolution which has something to say on the substance of the problem. So the resolution is taken into account in its totality. We are prepared to extend our fullest co-operation."

Answering further questions regarding the withdrawal of troops from Kashmir and the right to self-determination of the Kashmiris the Foreign Minister said:

"In so far as your first question is concerned I think you will agree with me that it would be dangerous to create a vacuum, if we withdraw without

a machinery to replace it with an impartial authority to take its place. I would not say that there will be a vacuum for India will fill that vacuum and void as she has done in the past and therefore I think it will not be possible for us to vacate before the machinery that replaces it is in fact on the ground.

"As far as the second question is concerned, I have already made the position clear that in defending the right to self-determination we are not taking a rigid position. Besides, your question is, I think, a little premature, because I cannot comment on the effort that the Security Council made in evolving the proposal. Proposals have to be seen before one can comment on them. But basically the question is that on self-determination we cannot surrender."

Answering a question regarding the so-called 'infiltrators' the Foreign Minister said:

"The question here is that, I think, slanderous charges have been made regarding these irregulars or as some people call them infiltrators. The main thing is that they cannot commit aggression against their own people. It is not conceivable for a people to commit aggression on their own people. These people who have gone to the support of the people of Jammu and Kashmir under Indian occupation, they are Kashmiris. They are none other than the Kashmiris. It is like a Texan going to the support of Texans and then it is regarded as an aggression against Texas or some one from California supporting people of their own State. So I think that must but be quite clear that these people are Kashmiris. They are indivisible. They cannot be divided from the rest of the people. The control over them is their own principle, their own faith and their own determination to see that peace is restored and that it is an honourable and proper peace."

Answering another question regarding the so-called infiltrators the Foreign Minister said:

"But the people of Jammu and Kashmir are not chattels for Pakistan to order them. They know their own interests and they know how to safeguard and protect their interests. We have no say in the matter. The question does not arise even hypothetically."

Answering a question on the role of the United Nations Organization, the Foreign Minister said:

"By moving meaningfully and constructively towards the solution, the United Nations would be contributing in bringing down political passions but here we are not concerned with either the passions of Pakistan or India, and if passions were to be the basis of approaching international problems then I doubt if international problems can be solved and the purpose of the United Nations would come into question if passions and prejudices were the way to tackle the future of five million people."

Answering a question regarding the support of the People's Republic of China for the right to self-determination for the Kashmiris the Foreign Minister said:

"The question is that the President referred to the moral support given by all states and on this question the People's Republic of China took a position on the basis of self-determination and on the basis of the aggression committed against Pakistan.

"Now if any country takes that position we do not have to go into the ideological background of that country. We are only concerned with the position that countries take on moral issues and so the question here does not arise of China's support or of any other country's support on the basis of ideology but on the basis of the support of that state to the people in the matter, firstly. Secondly, if India creates situations in which she has tensions with all her neighbours, and Pakistan is not the only country with which India has disputes, of course we are the principal target; we are their enemy number one. But India has disputes with other countries as well. India's disputes with China which are well-known and India's disputes with other countries in the region, I do not want to name those countries because it is not for me to speak on their behalf. But you are aware of other problems which India has in the region with so many other countries. Well, now, if India creates such situations that some of the neighbours are tempted to take advantage of the situation which India itself creates why should Pakistan be held responsible for that?"

Answering a question regarding Pakistan's other initiatives the Foreign Minister said:

"We were advised by all our friends that the Security Council and the Secretary-General should be given full opportunity to bring about a settlement. Now this was not a position that Pakistan took, but this is a position that was taken by the President of the United States and by many other friendly countries and it was in response and in deference to their point of view that we reluctantly accepted the cease-fire to give the Security Council its last opportunity. Now, it would be only fair and proper for the Security Council to exhaust all its efforts before we consider other initiatives, otherwise there will be cross-currents and we may find ourselves in a situation in which overlapping efforts are being made, and we would like to avoid that."

Answering a question regarding the President's visit to the United States, the Foreign Ministei said:

"I do not preclude the possibility of a visit by the President to the United States. You are aware of the invitation that he had received from President Johnson but so much depends on the conditions at home. The President of our country is the Chief Executive as well as Supreme

Commander and with a dangerous cease-fire and various other conditions at home I cannot say when he will come. But of course the invitation has been accepted in principle and the President would like to come and have a meeting with President Johnson and also if possible to come to the United Nations but I cannot say when that will be possible."

Answering a question regarding the views of the U.S. Secretary of State, Mr. Dean Rusk, on the question of plebiscite the Foreign Minister said:

"Confusion on Mr. Rusk is not in our mind but it is in the mind of all discussing and others who write about it. As far as we are concerned he has made a clear statement on plebiscite and we welcome that statement. He speaks not as Mr. Rusk but as Secretary of State of the United States Government."

Address to the Press Conference at Rawalpindi on October 5, 1965

Gentlemen,

First of all, I would like to make some observations on the Security Council's Resolution of 20 September. Pakistan supports and stands for the full implementation of this Resolution. The Resolution of the United Nations is not to be implemented in part only to the extent that it may suit one or the other party. For it to have true effectiveness, it has to be implemented in full. Pakistan, therefore, is co-operating in every way for the complete implementation of the Resolution, from top to bottom. This means that the military disengagement referred to in the earlier paragraph should take place side by side with the political settlement referred to in paragraphs 4 and 5 of the Resolution. We are prepared to co-operate in bringing about a cease-fire and measures connected with the cease-fire, but simultaneously we expect that the Security Council synchronises its efforts towards the settlement of the Jammu and Kashmir dispute on the basis of the wishes of the people of Jammu and Kashmir, as contained in the note of the Government of Pakistan to the Security Council, which was delivered by me to the Council on the night of 22 September.

Pakistan in accepting the Resolution of September 20th was not entirely satisfied with it but in the interest of international peace accepted it. I must also admit that the Resolution of 20 September is an improvement on the previous Resolutions of 4 and 6 September, which were wholly and utterly one-sided. Though the Resolutions only spoke of the return to the *status quo* without pledging a political settlement, the Resolutions of 4 and 6 September did not condemn Indian aggression, and did not re-affirm Security Council's previous resolutions on the Jammu and Kashmir dispute. Unfortunately, the Security Council and its members,

individually or collectively, did not show any anxiety to intervene when India began its series of aggression starting on the 15th of August when it re-occupied the Kargil posts. The Security Council was silent, its members were silent and the great powers were silent. Encouraged by the aggression on the 15th of August, India repeated aggression against the cease-fire line in the Tithwal Sector on 26 August, and then in Uri and Punch on 28 August, and Haji Pir Pass on the 30th of August. On the 23rd of August India shelled Awan Sharif, a village well within the international frontier of Pakistan. This train of acts, which were all clear and doubtless acts of aggression, did not provoke any international conscience or any international efforts to bring about peace. It is only when Pakistan acted in self-defence on the 1st or 2nd of September, in taking measures in the Chhumb or Bhimber sector, that the Security Council suddenly woke up to its grave responsibilities, and on the 4th of September passed a resolution calling for a return to the *status quo ante*, without any mention of its previous resolutions, nor any mention of the root cause of the conflict. And as I have said, these were one-sided resolutions. This was a one-sided resolution, repeated by another resolution which was equally one-sided on the 6th of September. And, for the first time in 18 years, the Security Council began to threaten sanctions. Sanctions were threatened on a one-sided resolution, without condemning an aggressor, and without re-affirming or making any reference to the Security Council's past responsibilities and commitments on the Jammu and Kashmir dispute. This is rather ironical and tragic that for the first time in 18 years of this dispute, when India had persistently violated clear and unambiguous resolutions of the Security Council on Jammu and Kashmir, there was no mention of sanctions, there was no word of sanctions, and now when the dice is loaded against the interest of justice and peace, for the first time the Security Council said that the country that does not accept this one-sided resolution, it will impose sanctions against it. The imposition of sanctions, let me tell you, gentlemen, would have had a disastrous effect, not on Pakistan against whom sanctions have already been imposed by the stoppage of military aid and assistance, but it would have had a disastrous effect on the United Nations itself. And as we are interested in this organization, for this reason alone we are very grateful to all the countries that opposed sanctions, particularly to France, because in so doing these countries, and particularly France, rendered assistance to the United Nations and to the cause of international peace. And I will repeat that, as far as my country is concerned, sanctions had already been imposed on us during the height of the war; and these sanctions hurt us badly. We were penalized for fidelity. However, that is a separate question.

Historically speaking, the Resolutions of 1948 and 1949, I would call

the Kashmir Resolutions, because those resolutions spoke of the right to self-determination of the people of Jammu and Kashmir. The resolutions of 4 and 6 September would be clearly "Indian Resolutions," because those resolutions wanted the restoration of the *status quo*, which meant freezing the cease-fire line into international frontier, which has been India's position ever since the Kashmir dispute arose. The Resolution of 20 September can be called a "China Resolution". I hope that the last and final resolution will be a Pakistan Resolution, becuase the destinies of the people of Pakistan and the people of Jammu and Kashmir are undistinguishable, inseparable, indivisible. Now that we have had a Kashmir Resolution and an Indian Resolution, and a China Resolution, I hope that the Security Council finally gives us what in justice would be a Pakistan Resolution, because that would not be a resolution favourable to Pakistan, but would be a resolution favourable to the cause of peace and in consonance with the dictates of morality.

I have said that the Resolution of 20 September would be called a "China Resolution" merely because the improvement made on the resolutions of 4 and 6 September appears to be motivated by the element of the ultimatum issued by the Chinese Government to the Government of India. It is no use concealing, but this ultimatum shook the foundations of the United Nations and caused the great powers great concern. It suddenly lifted them from their inertia, and at once it brought about a realization in them that it was imperative to bring about permanent peace in the sub-continent, and that this could only be done by the settlement of the Jammu and Kashmir dispute. They saw, in flesh and blood, the possibility of a conflagration much beyond the frontiers of India and Pakistan, the far-reaching and irreparable consequence disturbing the present equilibrium in Asia. Now whether there is any connection with India's aggression against Pakistan and China's ultimatum to India is a matter which I will refer to subsequently. The passing of the resolution of 20 September and the realization found among the great powers for the settlement of the Kashmir dispute has a decisive relevance. Gentlemen, this is the second time in a generation that India and Pakistan have gone to war. This is the second time in a generation that the United Nations has stopped that war with a promise of bringing about a purposeful and lasting peace. We made untold sacrifices in the first war and also now much greater sacrifices were made on this occasion. The United Nations intervened on the previous occasion and the United Nations has intervened again. This is the second time that we are placing our total faith and belief in the United Nations on a question of life and death for Pakistan. Surely, the United Nations cannot be that powerful as to make our sacrifices in vain, or that powerless as to be unable to implement its own charter. If the United

Nations is powerful enough to interpose, to intervene, arbitrate and bring about peace and stop bloodshed—bloodshed has not been made in vain, bloodshed has been made for a fundamental cause—then it must be powerful enough to implement its own resolutions, its own commitment. Today we believe the United Nations faces its greatest test and challenge. We will co-operate with it in every way as we have done in the past provided the United Nations means meaningfully to implement the totality of its own resolutions. The Resolution of September 20 has the support of the four great powers in the Security Council. They are bound in a way politically and morally to support these commitments both individually and collectively to implement their promises and pledges which have been publicly made. Indeed not only is the United Nations on test but so are the four great powers who have acted in concert and in co-operation to bring about this resolution and to force it on us. I must make it clear here that we do not want countries to support Pakistan. We do not want nations of the world to oppose India. We have no ill-will towards the people of India. What we actually want is for the nations of the world to be impartial, not to be partial. And if they are truly impartial, if they are truly objective, they will come to the right conclusion and the right judgement. And that right conclusion and right judgements made in impartiality would support Pakistan's cause. It is not that we want blind, passionate, fanatical, religious, subjective support for Pakistan. We want the world to judge the issue on its merit. We want them to determine the pros and cons, the merits and demerits of the issue. We want them to be uninfluenced by external factors. We want them to be uninfluenced by the consideration of relations with India and Pakistan. We want them to judge this matter as a judge judges a matter in a court. In so doing the nations of the world will take the right position, exactly the right position, the correct position, which is the position that Pakistan supports because Pakistan as an ideological, as an Islamic state will not support a wrong position, an immoral position. We support the right to self-determination to the people of Jammu and Kashmir. We want the world to know whether the right to self-determination is involved or not. If the nations of the world can come to the appreciation that the right to self-determination is involved that is all we expect of them. We want the world to judge whether an international agreement is involved or not. We want them to see and also appreciate and assess the data to conclude whether India and Pakistan have been a party to an international agreement on Kashmir or not. If we have not been a party to that agreement they can take a different position. If India and Pakistan have been a party to an international agreement then they must say that there is an international agreement. In so saying they are not supporting Pakistan or India, they are taking an objective, realistic, historical

position based on scientific data. We want them to judge that the Charter of the United Nations is being violated or not. We want them to see that Pakistan is right or wrong or India is right or wrong. They must assess and determine independently and objectively that the right to self-determination is involved or not, whether an international agreement approving that right to self-determination is involved or not, whether the United Nations Charter is involved or not and we leave it to their sense of justice, we leave it to their sense of morality, we leave it to their sense of sovereign greatness, as a sovereign independent state is to determine, whether Pakistan has taken the right position or the wrong position, whether India has taken the right or wrong position. Is that a fair proposition or not? And I cannot in this connection improve on what President Soekarno has said recently. I would like to quote what President Soekarno has said. On a platform of the Indonesian Islamic United Party's 53rd anniversary celebrations on the evening of 13 September, President Soekarno made the following declaration on behalf of the Indonesian people:

> "I have deliberately chosen to side with Pakistan in the conflict with India because in this struggle there is justice in the cause which Pakistan is fighting for. This is indeed the correct Islamic course of action and I, from this platform, send my personal appeal to all our brotherly Islamic countries to support Pakistan strongly. Do not be like Malaysia and say we are friends and obliged to both and therefore neutral. There is no neutrality when principle is involved. There is no compromise when truth is there for you to see. I say to those foreign correspondents and diplomats who are present here tonight carry my words and despatch them to all corners, for truth is here manifest and must be supported."

This is our position that a principle is involved on which there can be no compromise. The truth is involved on which there can be no compromise. Now it is on the basis of this consideration that we have taken our attitude to the various countries that have taken their position on this grave and fundamental issue of right and wrong to be objectively determined. Where distinction has to be drawn between the aggressor and the aggressed and in taking all these factors into consideration, not because our individual position is involved as a sovereign state but because our position is involved as a country in the comity of nations that Pakistan has decided from now on to sever all relations with Malaysia. This is not because Malaysia has taken a position which can be regarded as anti-Pakistan. This is not the way the Government of Pakistan functions. We have decided to sever relations with Malaysia because that State has taken an immoral position, that state has refused to make a distinction between an aggressor and the aggressed, that state has been blind to the principle of self-determination, that state has chosen to ignore all international agree-

ments and the sanctity of international agreements and of the doctrine of *Pacta Sunt Sarvanda*, that state has violated the solidarity of the Afro-Asian world, that state has undermined the principles of international morality and international justice and it was for that reason that Pakistan has severed all relations with Malaysia. We have re-called our Ambassador from Malaysia and we have given them time to wind up their diplomatic representation and activities in our country.

Now, gentlemen, India has attempted to frustrate the Resolution of the 20th of September which we have accepted in its entirety. This is so because India has acted violently to the impartial attitude taken by the whole world. Here, I must say because of our relations in the Commonwealth and because of the historical position of the United Kingdom in the sub-continent India has been ungracious and uncharitable to the United Kingdom. The United Kingdom has not taken a pro-Pakistan position. All that the United Kingdom has done is to re-state and re-affirm its position which it has taken in the last eighteen years along with so many other countries on the right to self-determination of the people of Jammu and Kashmir. Indeed, no country is more acquainted with the problem of Jammu and Kashmir than the United Kingdom. I do not say this disparagingly, the United Kingdom is responsible for it, not as a deliberate act, but when a great power leaves a country of the size of the sub-continent with partition, there is bound to be aftermath, there is bound to be legacy left behind. In any event, that is a thing of the past. But in condemning the United Kingdom, India should not be unmindful that it has hold over the Gurdaspur District in the Punjab which gave it a link to Jammu and Kashmir. The first Governor-General of India took certain positions in the interest of India. India should not be unmindful of Assam and of the Radcliff Award. India's memory should not be so short as to forget the great services the United Kingdom has rendered to India. I will not say that we have not had our differences with the United Kingdom. On many occasions we differed fundamentally with the United Kingdom, and I dare say that the severing of relations with Malaysia will be commented upon adversely by a section of the United Kingdom Press, the Economist, which is not very economical with its language and which in its beautiful language says ugly things, and it is bound to say such things on this occasion too, as it has been saying in the past. But these are not the grave issues which affect relations between states. And in relations with countries one has to take the whole history into account, the good and the bad, the advantages and the disadvantages. But it is most unfortunate that India should threaten to leave the Commonwealth, merely because the United Kingdom has taken a historical decision and a correct and impartial decision, that India should threaten to nationalize all interests of the United Kingdom in India. Well, these are

empty threats and should not deter the great people of Great Britain because we are also members of the Commonwealth and what is good for the goose is good for the gander and as long as we are members of the Commonwealth, India dare not leave the Commonwealth. Mr. Nehru had great vision and all that we accept. In many ways he was a great man, but he chose to remain in the Commonwealth not because he wanted to make it a multiracial institution but because of the presence of Pakistan, and it was a much more pragmatic consideration that compelled him to remain in the Commonwealth. So, it is no use for India to try to frighten the two great powers. Recently Prime Minister Shastri has said that India will have to resort to desperate measures if the great powers make an effort to compel a settlement on India. Now, in a way, I am sorry to say, this is biting the hand that feeds you. India is going to resort to desperate measures against the United Kingdom, against France, against the United States of America, against the Soviet Union, if in the interest of international peace and justice, if in the interest of implementation of international agreement these big powers, committed to their pledge, make an effort to bring about a lasting peace for over five hundred million people in this sub-continent and to spare the sub-continent from the agonies of war in future, to spare the sub-continent from being set ablaze in future, to save the flower of our manhood to be decimated and destroyed. If in these attempts the great powers seek to bring peace, India which is so wholly dependent on the grace and on the goodness of the great powers should now begin to threaten them. Gentlemen, India cannot be permitted to make a success of its isolation. India cannot be permitted to blackmail the world because she is weak. On the one hand, Prime Minister Shastri says, he is so weak that he cannot effect a settlement of Kashmir. I think this is a remarkable and astonishing admission made by the Prime Minister of the largest democracy in the world and of the great secular Asian State which has pretensions to the leadership of the Afro-Asian world and has pretensions to have influence stretching from the Mekong river to the Hindukush mountains, a state, the only state in Asia and Africa, which has dependencies, a poor weak state which cannot effect the Kashmir settlement, which has economic problems, which has a tottering polity, which has fissiparous tendencies, which is dependent wholly for its food from abroad and gifts and on the bowls of charity, is, on the one hand, weak and cannot effect an honourable and equitable settlement of Kashmir based on its pledge, and, on the other hand, is so strong that it can defy all the great powers, that it defies the four great powers—obviously it is not indulging in flirtation with the fifth one which is the People's Republic of China—I use the word 'flirtation' advisedly. So, India, in its isolation so wholly dependent on the great powers' benevolence and grace, is now threatening great powers merely

because great powers are seeking to act in morality, the country which has dependencies, an Asian country which has not only Jammu and Kashmir under its subjugation but has dependencies in Sikkim and Bhutan—a most anomalous situation and phenomenon of independence in the Afro-Asian countries: this tottering polity which is leaderless. Nehru had his weaknesses, Nehru was responsible for the Kashmir dispute, Nehru had his dispute with us, but he did not, like his successors, bring about a desperate situation. He did not at least bring about a forcible integration of the State of Jammu and Kashmir into the Indian Union. He did not seek to reduce to some extent the personality of Jammu and Kashmir into a province of that Union, he did not violate the cease-fire line as his successors, he did not indulge in genocide and throwing out the Kashmiri Muslims to create a belt of safety. He did not heap up one provocation on top of another, at least he did not add tension to tension. These successors of Nehru who are myopic, who do not have the love and resolution of Nehru, they have brought about this situation, they have forced a situation on the sub-continent. It is for them to realize that if they continue to press these policies, there will be conflagration again, there will be disaster again. India's internal weaknesses have nothing to do with the settlement of the Kashmir dispute, as Kashmir is not a part of India and is no concern to India. As a matter of fact, India is weak because it is carrying the liability of Jammu and Kashmir. Just as colonial powers realized after the second World War that they had to abandon their colonies in order to save themselves and save their economy, it is about time that India abandoned her colony of Jammu and Kashmir in order to strengthen herself internally. India would become stronger by relieving itself of the liability of Jammu and Kashmir.

I have already said that India is breaking the cease-fire agreement and violating the Resolution of 20 September. By so doing India seeks to attain by violation of cease-fire what she could not attain on the battle-field. This is an intolerable position and this cannot be permitted. We have protested to the United Nations. We have given our word and as a sovereign state we intend to fulfil our word. But if India continues the provocation, if India seeks in broad day-light to again shatter its promises and pledges and destroy the cease-fire line with the avowed and malicious intent of achieving by this means what she could not achieve on the battle-field, she will be responsible for the full consequences of her delinquency. It is for the United Nations to take effective measures to prevent India from violating the cease-fire, as again in self-defence Pakistan will have to take appropriate measures within its rights to defend its territory and to uphold the Resolution of 20 September.

Gentlemen, I would take this opportunity to pay my tribute to the

Armed Forces of Pakistan. For Pakistan this has been a battle for survival—a country has been made into a nation. A hundred million people have been cemented by their blood and by their valour. We have to fight the monstrous might of India and our Armed Forces and our people fought it heroically and valiantly against overwhelming odds, not because we were born brave, but because our cause is just. We are fighting for a righteous cause, we are fighting against a predatory aggressor and we are fighting for the principle of self-determination. It has been in many ways a war of the young, because Pakistan is a young state and the youth of Pakistan has been involved in this war and our forces, as I have said, have shown exemplary courage, heroism unparalleled in contemporary time. And this is so because our cause is just and we are fighting for the principle and we are fighting for truth and thereby to uphold international morality and international agreement and fighting for the sacred soil of Pakistan which includes Jammu and Kashmir. And in paying tributes to our Armed Forces I cannot but pay tributes to our whole people for it has been a people's war, all our people have fought, the brave Balochs, the gallant people of the Frontier, the Pathans, the people of Sind from their desert home and the Bengalis on the soil of West Pakistan, and above all, the people of the Punjab. Truly, the Punjab is the sword-arm of the sub-continent. The heroic people of Lahore and Sialkot in particular deserve the nation's gratitude. This has been Dunkirk but in the reverse and I cannot find words sufficient enough to express my feelings for the brave people of Punjab and Sialkot, who stood like steel against the armoured, predatory and wanton aggressor. And when I say we will fight for a thousand years, I mean it. It does not mean that we have abandoned because there is a cease-fire. Until the problem of Kashmir and Jammu is settled honourably and equitably according to the wishes of the people of Jammu and Kashmir, Pakistan will wage ceaselessly a war in self-defence. Pakistan will never abandon its right, Pakistan will never surrender its rights, that is what I mean that we shall fight for a thousand years. Our spirit shall never be destroyed. We shall never compromise our honour. We have made pledges to the people of Jammu and Kashmir and history may be rubbed off, but we will not surrender, we will not budge an inch. There will be one round, there will be a second round, there will be a third round, there will be a fourth round, there will be a fifth round, there will be rounds after rounds, but we will have to, one day, vindicate our pledges to the people of Jammu and Kashmir. This is what I mean that we will fight for a thousand years. It does not mean a war, it does not mean a phase. There was war in 1948, there is a war in 1965, but 1948 and 1965 are only comas in the long essay of the nation and we will go on and on relentlessly, resolutely in peace and justice, in self-defence, in honour and in truth

to continue the struggle till we meet the test and we are bound to succeed in the end. Let me tell you, individuals may go, but we are bound to succeed in the end. I have no doubt in my mind that we must succeed in the end.

How can a righteous cause fail? How can we be an exception? Have we committed some unforgivable sin against God and men that we alone shall be victims of tyranny and oppression and terror and that we alone shall be subject to domination for all times when the rest of the world shall be free? How can Pakistan alone, how can the people of Kashmir alone be an exception to the great forces of principle and freedom that have inspired and spread throughout the world? This cannot be, this is impossible and that is why I say our spirit shall never break. Genocide or no genocide, twenty-one divisions or forty-one divisions, atomic bombs or no atomic bombs, Tshombe or Trombay, whatever it is—they can have their Trombays and they can have their Tshombes—but we will succeed in the end, whatever they have. Because ours is a just cause, ours is a righteous cause and we cannot fail, we must not fail. We are Muslims and we are fighters. We are fighters because we are Muslims and we are Muslims because we are fighters. But what do we fight for? We do not fight wars of aggression. We do not, according to the school-boys' books, wage wars of sword and fire. We are not infidels and aggressors. We fight, gentlemen, for truth, we fight for peace, we fight for justice, we fight for honour, we fight for self-respect, we fight for sovereignty, we fight for the meek and the weak. And others can tell us, then in that case, Christians are fighters, Hindus are fighters, Communists are fighters. That is all very good. Let us all fight together for common struggle. Let us all fight against oppression. Let us all fight against domination. Let us all fight against tyranny and you as Christians and we as Muslims fight. You as Christians fight and others as Communists fight and where is our contact point, that is the point of our embrace: where is our point of confrontation, that is a point which is in principle against immorality. At that stage when we embrace and when we confront, we do not ask each other whether you are a Muslim, Christian or Hindu or a Communist. We ask each other that we are fighting for a righteous cause, that we are fighting for victims of aggression against an aggressor and whether we are fighting for morality against immorality. That is where civilizations join hands. That is where the forces of morality combine.

That brings me to the charge of collusion with China. I hope the context in which I have said it would already answer what I have said regarding collusion with China. But if we are all fighting for a righteous cause then it makes no difference what your ideology is or what your background is because that is the point of contact, of principles, of morality for the aim of civilization. At that time we do not see each other's labels, we do not see

the colour of each other's skin, we do not see that we are black or white. At that time we are all heroic fighters in a common cause. Collusion, gentlemen, is a dirty word. It is a word which applies to criminals. In one stroke, eight hundred million people cannot become criminals. There is no secret agreement between Pakistan and China. Let me repeat that there is no secret agreement between Pakistan and China. There is no covert agreement between Pakistan and China. It is not our fault if India has committed aggression against China. It is not China's fault if India has committed aggression against Pakistan. We are both neighbouring states. Both of use are victims of Indian aggression and chauvinism. If in such a situation India creates problems throughout this region, if India seeks to have disputes with Pakistan, if India seeks to commit aggression against Pakistan, if India seeks to have disputes with China, if India seeks to commit aggression against China, how can any one say that there is collusion between China and Pakistan? All that I can say is that both countries have been victims of aggression. With both countries India refuses to settle its boundary disputes. Both countries have grievances against India. India has wronged both countries and if in that, on the basis of morality, on the basis of international law, some synchronisation takes place as a result of Indian action, as a result of each country pursuing its objective, vital interest independent of the other, I am afraid that cannot be regarded as sinister or a factor of collaboration. If in 1962, Pakistan had taken advantage of the Sino-Indian conflict and done something, would that have established collusion or agreement between Pakistan and China? Merely because in 1962 we chose to be good boys and did not take advantage of it, therefore, there is no collusion. But merely because in the present situation China may have to deal with India, would that be regarded as a secret agreement between China and Pakistan? If China supports the cause against aggression in the Congo, and I will only confine it to the Congo and nowhere else, so do not misquote me, then would that be a collusion between China and Africa? If China has in this situation told India that she should vacate her aggression from Chinese territory, would that be what Pakistan wants? Certainly not, certainly not. And if there is an agreement between China and Pakistan, why should we be afraid to admit it? If we have an agreement, will the heavens fall if we admit it? If we have an agreement to say that in the event of Indian aggression against China and Pakistan, certain common action will be taken. We can say that as a sovereign state, we have a right to do it. We have waged the war against India in self-defence. If we had the right to defend our territory, we have the right to enter into agreements for the defence of our territory. So, if there was an agreement between Pakistan and China we will declare it to the world, but because there is no agreement between Pakistan and China, I can declare it to the

world that there is no agreement between Pakistan and China and if India seeks to exploit it, if India wants to take advantage of it, if India wants to hoodwink the world, if India wants to blackmail the world, then that is not our responsibility. I say a thousand times that there is no agreement between Pakistan and China and there is no secret agreement. I say a thousand times that there is no secret agreement, and if there were, I would say a thousand times there is agreement between Pakistan and China. I hope that is clear enough and I hope that will be clear enough for all times. But never use the word 'collusion'. It is a dirty word, not applicable to self-respecting sovereign states. If there is agreement, we will admit as a sovereign state that there is agreement between us. The fact is that there isn't. We have to say that there is no agreement.

Gentlemen, the era of domination has come to an end. The future is one of collaboration and confidence. It is not based on the might and power of the states, it is not based on the acquisition and the stockpiling of atomic and nuclear bombs. It is based on affection, on understanding, on promotion of goodwill. We are now entering the phase of continental nationalism, which is different but not opposed to our traditional nationalism. That is why we see today the emergence of continental nationals, of a European Europe, of an African Africa, of an Asian Asia, and an American America. This is the era of continental nationalism. And as a nation of hundred million people of Pakistan, we have passion for Pakistan, we have beliefs in Pakistan. With all our hearts and with all our faith now that Pakistan will play a great and constructive and massive role in the promotion of continental nationalism which will collaborate with continental nationalism of Asia, of Africa, of Europe and of America.

Sometimes Pakistan is called a truncated state. I have never looked upon Pakistan as a truncated state. I have seen Pakistan as two mighty pillars, pushing against a predatory aggressor and a reactionary, ruthless country, these mighty pillars sandwitching an evil force. That is what Pakistan is. Two mighty pillars, not separated by a thousand miles of Indian territory as the Anglo-Saxon jargon describes Pakistan, but two mighty Islamic pillars of peace pressing their weight against a feeble, flippant society, a decadent society. That is Pakistan; Pakistan which will have a role to play for the promotion of peace in Asia and for better understanding in the whole world. When I talk about continental nationalism and the end of the era of domination, that just as in Eastern Europe and other parts of Europe, when they were subjected to domination and in one form or the other that domination separated Western Europe from Eastern Europe, it created a barren problem, it created a gulf between Eastern and Western Europe, yet because they both suffered from domination it brought Europe closer simultaneously. So our domination in Asia also separated us, but once that

domination is lifted, Asia will also come closer. Once the domination of Africa is lifted and it has been lifted, and we will march together because that domination also brought about a sense of unity in Asia and in Africa as much as after the second World War the separation of Europe brought Europe together. And today we see barriers between Eastern Europe and Western Europe being lifted, we see agreements which are leading to a detente. This is the evolution of our times and we will make our full contribution to it.

Now finally I would like to end on a personal note if you permit me. I have once been to Edinburgh University. In Edinburgh I saw the University. At its portal is written: "They have said, what say they, let them say." We have seen a massive canard in a section of the Western press attributing conflicts in the Government of Pakistan, differences of opinion; various rumours are afloat; speculations. I say in answer to all these slanders: "they have said, what say they, let them say." The Government of Pakistan is not a banana republic. It does not go on the basis of what one individual does or what one individual says. I may say this and I speak with authority of my President with whom I discussed this matter last night. He said, I authorise you to say that "I welcome in my Government freedom of expression. I respect freedom of expression. I admire it and there are occasions and times when like all Governments different brands of views are expressed, different interpretations are given, different assessments are made. But they are all made in good faith, they are all made in the interests of the country." It is collective wisdom of the Government. So he says that I welcome these different points of view; I like to hear them; I encourage them but finally when the decisions are taken, they are the decisions of the Government of Pakistan. And I would like to say that in this context, within these qualifications, the Government of Pakistan stands united as a rock for the defence of its country and for the defence of its people to face all dangers grave and great as they may be. Our spirit and our powers and our faculties are united and we shall wage the struggle for a thousand years in that spirit without faculty and without power.

Address to the Press Conference at New York on November 5, 1965

Good Afternoon, Ladies and Gentlemen,

I must admit that I am speaking under a certain amount of disability because I hav'nt been able to mobilize the entire bureaucracy of Pakistan to have a written text as was submitted by the Indian Foreign Minister in the course of his statement this afternoon to you. However, that is not necessary, not because of any particular ability or talent but because the cause of Pakistan is so just, equitable and fair that it is possible to meet you at short notice to discuss the grave issues that face us.

Briefly, I would like to say that you are aware of all the resolutions that have been recently passed on the Jammu and Kashmir dispute by the Security Council on 4th, 6th, 20th, 27th September and 5th November. During my previous visit to the United Nations, I held a Press Conference and we discussed some of these problems and the resolutions and I went home and returned here for this particular meeting which has finished today. Before I left, if you remember, all of you who attended my Press Conference, I had said that the dispute of Jammu and Kashmir, which has taken India and Pakistan to war twice in a generation and has caused so much trouble, turmoil and misery to the sub-continent, has to be settled on a fair and equitable basis. I think there is a general realization everywhere throughout the world, which you must have witnessed in the United Nations itself, in the Security Council, that today when we discussed the Jammu and Kashmir dispute, all members of the Security Council, without exception, mentioned the gravity of the situation, stressing need, to bring a lasting peace and friendship to the people of India and Pakistan who have so many common affinities. The resolution of today culminates a great deal of diplomatic activity. I think that at one stage it was believed that the Security Council would not meet

at this juncture to discuss the Jammu and Kashmir dispute so much so that, I am informed reliably, that the Foreign Minister of India was leaving for India just before it was announced that the Security Council would meet to discuss the Jammu and Kashmir dispute. So, in the teeth of India's opposition to a meeting of the Security Council, the Security Council met and when the Security Council met, India was not only disappointed but dismayed by the fact that the Security Council was to meet, the Indian delegation took the extraordinary position of placing conditions for a meeting of the Security Council. Now I want to make it quite clear to you here that Pakistan was never a party to any conditions that India made; we were absolutely unaware of any negotiations that took place between India or any of the Security Council members and we attended the Security Council meeting on the assumption that like all issues which come before the Council, the whole dispute, all the problems, all its implications, all its history would be brought before the Council so that the Council was in a position to determine the situation as it exists. If Pakistan had been a party to any conditions that were imposed by India, I can tell you quite plainly that, we would have abided by these conditions. This is actually a part of the whole problem between Pakistan and India: Whereas Pakistan when once it makes a commitment, whether that commitment is to Pakistan's advantage or disadvantage, Pakistan has always fulfilled these commitments and its pledges, because we believe, as a sovereign state, representing a hundred million people, and taking into account not the immediate exigencies and expediencies of the situation but the long range view that it is in the interest of peace, it is in the interest of tradition, to establish cordial relations between neighbours and states and abide by one's commitments. This has been our whole attitude to India and unfortunately we have these disputes because India's attitude has been absolutely to the reverse, in contradistinction to the attitude of Pakistan, India in broad daylight, of its own free will and volition makes agreements, commitments and then tries to wriggle out of them on one pretext or another. This does not apply only to the dispute of Jammu and Kashmir which, of course, is the most fundamental dispute facing India and Pakistan, but a host of other problems and to give another important instance of this attitude, the mentality, the psychosis of India in entering into commitments and thereafter violating them, is the case of Beru-Bari enclave—an important enclave—which was in dispute between India and Pakistan and the Indian Government agreed that that enclave would be transferred to Pakistan and since 1958, on one pretext or the other, the Indian Government has resisted the fulfilment of its commitments, sometimes on constitutional grounds, sometimes on others. But that is beside the point. The main point that I am trying to make here is that if we had been, Pakistan had been a party to any understanding or any commitment whether it was

to our interest or not to our interest, whether it was to our advantage or our disadvantage, we would have definitely abided by that commitment but no such commitment was made and no such commitment could have indeed been made, bearing in mind the procedure and the rules and the norms of the United Nations' Charter. However, because as I said, India was surprised and dismayed that a Council meeting was to be held on Jammu and Kashmir, it threatened not to attend this Security Council meeting and we were never informed even subsequently that India had agreed on condition that only the cease-fire and withdrawals would be discussed and I told you that we are completely unaware of this understanding, we are not aware of it in any form and we are not a party to it. But objectively speaking, it would be impossible, it would be against the very purposes of the United Nations Charter that such conditions were to be imposed for the Security Council to meet, and because the Security Council rightly agreed to discuss the whole problem in its totality, the Indian delegation took the extraordinary measure of staging a walk-out from the Security Council. Now explanations are given for the walk-out but in the eventual scrutiny all the developments will show that first of all India did not want a meeting of the Security Council, and secondly, when the Security Council meeting was held India tried to impose a condition and it failed to get the condition to be fulfilled and rightly so, it staged a walk-out. It refused to discuss the Jammu and Kashmir dispute—a dispute which has been before the Security Council for eighteen years and which the whole world knows is a dispute between India and Pakistan—and took the position that Jammu and Kashmir is an integral part of the Indian Union and therefore it would refuse to discuss it.

It was India that brought the dispute to the Security Council. It was India that in 1948 brought the Jammu and Kashmir dispute to the Security Council. It is India that has recognized by various means that the Jammu and Kashmir dispute exists, by its repression and genocide in the State of Jammu and Kashmir, which has continued unabatedly, which has its ups and downs and now has reached its apogee in Jammu and Kashmir and yet this is the way it treats its fraternal citizens. If the people of Jammu and Kashmir are an integral and inseparable and inextricable part of India why does India then conduct such repressions, such horrors, such tyranny? Why does it liquidate people, burn villages? This is not an allegation that I make. Your correspondents, some of whom had the privilege of filtering through into the Iron Curtain which is imposed on Jammu and Kashmir, from *New York Times*, from German newspapers, from French newspapers, other responsible journalists that have gone there and had seen the repression and horror that is being experienced today by the people of Jammu and Kashmir. Is that the way a civilized nation in the 20th century treats its own citizens? I ask you this question objectively and because this is a pitiful and abominable

situation that exists in Jammu and Kashmir. We have asked the Security Council to send a team for investigation; if it is not the Security Council, any one is free whether it is an official body, or an unofficial body, any humanitarian organization from any part of the world to go and determine for themselves as to what is happening in the State of Jammu and Kashmir and to witness for themselves the repression. In the Security Council meeting I mentioned that a former Finance Minister of India, who was an aspirant for the Prime Ministership of India, Morarji Desai, said that he would want to see the whole of Jammu and Kashmir burnt if they want to struggle for their independence and for their right to self-determination, which was promised to them by India in the Security Council bilaterally and unilaterally. This is like a quotation in a recent book where Hitler said "Is Paris burning?" Naturally Hitler wanted to know that Paris was burning. For Paris is Paris and not a part of the Third Reich. So, as I can understand, why Indian leaders would want to see the Jammu and Kashmir burnt, because Jammu and Kashmir is not a part of India. It is a question of territorial aggrandizement. So these are the hard facts. These are the realities. These are the nightmares which we face in the sub-continent. And we want to put an end to them for all times. It is said that the present rulers of Pakistan are not amenable to a settlement and that the Indian Government would not like to discuss the issue with the present rulers of Pakistan. The Jammu and Kashmir dispute has existence of eighteen years. This regime came to office or Government came to office only seven years ago. But the dispute has existed for eighteen years, and even the Government of Field Marshal Ayub Khan had made many overtures and taken many initiatives to arrive at a settlement with India. As a matter of fact our Government has arrived at more settlements with the Government of India than any previous Government of Pakistan. We have settled boundary disputes with India, and a number of other sensitive problems. We have sorted out questions pertaining to the rights of the properties of refugees and a host of other problems. It was the Government of Field Marshal Ayub Khan which concluded with the Government of India the Indus Basin Treaty Agreement of 1960. You are aware that it was a very difficult and very complicated problem and it was this Government, this very regime that concluded an agreement with India which goes to rank only second to Jammu and Kashmir in importance of disputes that exist between Pakistan and India. So these are all irrelevant and extraneous considerations. Time and again one reason or another has been advanced to prevent an equitable and honourable settlement of Jammu and Kashmir. In the beginning it was said that Pakistan by entering into military alliances—this was before the regime of Field Marshal Ayub Khan—had brought about a change in the situation and therefore India could not consider the question of settlement of Jammu and

Kashmir dispute because of the foreign policy of Pakistan. We had entered into the CENTO and the SEATO and therefore according to the Indians we had brought war to the doorsteps of India, cold war, and as such, India said, the situation had completely changed and therefore India refused to discuss the dispute of Jammu and Kashmir; and the answer to that is very simple that for the foreign policy of Pakistan why should the people of Jammu and Kashmir suffer? That was what it said in the early days of 1953. Thereafter it was said that the Jammu and Kashmir dispute could not be settled because if that dispute was settled, the Muslims of India would face annihilation. And this war has shown that it is not a religious issue: it is a question of self-determination, because Indians have said that the Muslims of India fought as bravely as any other Indians for their homeland and we appreciate that. We expect them to fight for India but an Indian India. After all, Kashmir is not an Indian India and therefore the question of the religious victimization of Muslims or holding them as hostages, as has been shown, cannot be applicable. Then it is said that it will lead to the disintegration of India. I think this is a preposterous argument that a country like India with four hundred million people—a great Asian country—should take up position, an official position, that if a disputed territory— a territory that does not belong to the people of India and which India has said has a right to determine its own future—does determine its own future, India should take up the position that this will lead to the disintegration of India.

These are all the express *facto-rational* well worth seeing in the Security Council itself. That they did not want a meeting and when the meeting was held they imposed some unreasonable conditions and when those conditions were not fulfilled they walked out and gave various other extraneous reasons and I see from the statement of India's Foreign Minister that he has in his concluding remarks made some references to what I said. I have and our people and our Government have a deep regard for the people of India. We are part of the same sub-continent. We have been living together for centuries and I think the Indian representative and the Indian Government know the unremitting and ceaseless efforts we have made to establish good relations with India and we would expect the people of India to know that we are part of the same sub-continent, with them we share many affinities. We have great respect and regard for them and it is not right to say that I will make a central issue, an issue of this provocation. It was a grave provocation, even in the spell of the meeting where third secretaries or second secretaries represent a country, representatives don't walk out or interrupt in the midst of a statement that is being made by representatives on such issues. It is first of all a grave provocation and unprecedented provocation. Secondly, I would like to make it quite clear to you that even during the course of hostilities in the midst of this war, we have taken

many initiatives to try and establish contact with the Indian leaders, with the Foreign Minister of India and on a number of occasions I have met him in social contacts and tried to establish contact with him; when the President of the Security Council wanted us to meet for lunch I said I'll be very honoured to discuss anything with him. After all we have come to equity with clean hands. Our hands are clean. Therefore we can look at them in the eyes and we are not frightened speaking and discussing the issue of Jammu and Kashmir with the Indian leaders, and I said to the President of the Security Council that without conditions I am prepared to meet and discuss issues that face us so that we can resolve them. Nobody likes to be faced with disputes and problems and difficulties, we want to put an end to all these disputes and it is our intention to do so, but even when we drew up a line, the Indian Foreign Minister said that he was not prepared to meet the Pakistan delegation even at the social meeting at lunch which the President of the Security Council, last month, tried to arrange.

So you should take every thing into account. You cannot be held responsible for the frenzied flow of the situation in a grave provocation and if it has happened so much I am very sorry that it has happened so much and I do feel that it has caused them some grievance, I am sorry for it. But these are not the problems which should affect the fundamental dispute, which should affect the question of the future of our sub-continent, which should affect the lives of our children and our children's children which should affect the whole future of our two countries. These are much bigger issues and if they can settle the Jammu and Kashmir dispute by the removal of one or two people, I am personally prepared like Garibaldi to go and retire for all times from public life if it is going to bring about the end of the Jammu and Kashmir dispute. But that is not the problem. They have no intention of settling the Jammu and Kashmir dispute and therefore one pretext or another they advance. Now to their belief, the Indian Foreign Minister said, "Well, this resolution today is favourable to India because it takes into account only the question of cease-fire and withdrawal." Well we also want a cease-fire and withdrawal, if cease-fire and withdrawal are necessary to tackle the main problem, to tackle the Jammu and Kashmir dispute. It is not that we want cease-fire and withdrawal because India is in an advantageous position and we are in a disadvantageous position. This is not the case. Firstly, because we have agreed to the resolution and as I told you once if we make a commitment we abide by that commitment. That is question number one. Question number two: Everyone tells us that cease-fire and withdrawal are essential prerequisites for the determination of the Jammu and Kashmir dispute. If that is the case we are prepared to co-operate in every way possible. So it is not that it is a victory or triumph of India because there

is a reference to cease-fire and withdrawal but for the two reasons tha I have said, hat is acceptable to us. You will a o recall tha this resolution reaffirms the resolution of September 20 in all its parts. The September 20 resolution is a key resolution. It goes to the heart of the problem when it says that it reaffirms "in all its parts;" that should be all its parts including everything which is in the preamble where there is a reference to the Jammu and Kashmir dispute and I would like to quote: "*convinced* that an early cessation of hostilities is essential as a first step towards a peaceful settlement of the outstanding differences between the two countries on Kashmir and other related matters", (other related matters being related to Kashmir) and then paragraph four which says: "DECIDES to consider as soon as operative. Paragraph 1 of the Council's Resolution 210 of 6th September has been implemented, what steps could be taken to assist towards a settlement of the political problem underlying the present conflict, and in the meantime calls the two Governments to utilize all peaceful means including those listed in article 33 of the Charter to this end", and paragraph 5 "REQUESTS the Secretary-General to exert every possible effort to give effect to this resolution, to seek a peaceful solution and to report to the Security Council thereon". And this resolution today reaffirms in all its parts the resolution of September 20 which makes a mention in the preamble to the Jummu and Kashmir dispute in paragraph 4 and paragraph 5. You have heard the statements of all the representatives in the Security Council. All of them addressed themselves to the importance of tackling the basic issue *i.e.,* the settlement of the Jammu and Kashmir dispute. And Jordan abstained because it believed that this resolution of September 20 did not go far enough. It should have gone further than it has gone. The Soviet Union abstained not because it disagreed with the substance of the resolution but on account of matters not directly connected with the Jammu and Kashmir dispute, on constitutional and financial problems, which are well-known and which have a history to them. Mr. Fedorenko in his statement, as soon as he began to speak, mentioned twice that at present the main thing was the cease-fire and withdrawal and that they would have agreed not to abstain, they would have agreed to maintain the unanimity if it had not been for both the constitutional and financial questions over which there was a deadlock. So actually in effect the entire Security Council, all the members, permanent and non-permanent, have really supported this resolution and this resolution talks about cease-fire which is acceptable to us, it talks about withdrawals which are acceptable to us, and it says that these two prerequisites are necessary in order to tackle the main problem, because it says in the operative part that it reaffirms the Resolution of 20th September in all its parts which is a key resolution; so we are completely satisfied. And I return home to

Pakistan with the satisfaction of knowing that the Security Council co-operated for a just and honourable progress of the Jammu and Kashmir dispute and that if they maintain this determination, if we maintain this attitude, if we have the vision to save five hundred million people from a blood-bath, I believe progress will be made for a settlement of the Jammu and Kashmir dispute. It is no use for the Indian Government or for the Indian delegation to close its eyes to all these self-evident realities. We are aware of the fact that India did not want a meeting; in the teeth of opposition there was a meeting, there was a reference to the substantive aspects in the speeches clearly and unambiguously by all the members including each and every member and also the resolution itself is a vindication of a righteous position and when I say that I do not say a pro-Pakistan position but an anti-Indian position. The Jammu and Kashmir dispute is not a question of a romance where someone likes someone and someone dislikes someone. (Laughter from the audience). It is a question of taking up a correct and right position and once you take a correct or right position you are bound to come to the necessary conclusion and I think the Security Council has come to the necessary conclusion.

I am sorry for making a lengthy statement for I thought that before I leave, and I leave this evening, it would be my pleasure and privilege to meet you and acquaint you with the developments that have taken place culminating in the statement.

Answers to Questions

Thereafter a number of questions were asked. Answering questions regarding withdrawal of troops the Foreign Minister said:

> "I have told you that our position is that once we accept a position we take it with all its implications."

Answering a question regarding the so-called "infiltrators" Mr. Bhutto said:

> "You see, the Indians unfortunately see an infiltrator behind every bush. That is because they have held that place under suppression. I am not now quoting our sources. You see the *New York Times* where now school children, university students are in the movement for self-determination. All the accredited leaders of Jammu and Kashmir are behind bars and Sh. Abdullah, you know what is his fate at present. And the fate of other leaders like Farooq that have been arrested. Maulana Masoodi, a moderate leader, almost all the leaders of the State are behind bars and it is the movement of the people. You can draw the analogies between the situation in Jammu and Kashmir and the debate that has taken place yesterday on an African complaint and you will see the

similarity."

Answering another question the Foreign Minister said:

"Yes. Well there is also a contradiction. On the one hand the Indian Government takes the position that there is nothing to discuss at all. That Jammu and Kashmir is an integral part of India and the contradiction becomes all the more self-evident and exposed when you take into account the history and the background of the situation and what India had said to us 'You keep your part of Jammu and Kashmir in your occupation, we keep our part of it'. This is their position which they have been saying all this time. And we told them this is not a territorial dispute for us. You cannot demarcate a people but you can demarcate a territory. Our position has been that we cannot take back the situation. We have to take into account what the people want. So the first contradiction here is that on the one hand they say it is a closed chapter; there is nothing to discuss or to debate. And they are told there is something to discuss and debate, then they say, well, the only thing to discuss and debate is to extend the repression and colonialism of India to the other parts of Jammu and Kashmir. Then subsequently they may want certain parts of Nepal also and for the same purpose, of East Pakistan to an insatiable appetite of chauvinistic power."

Answering another question regarding the so-called "infiltrators" the Foreign Minister said:

"Infiltrators can only come from outside, cease-fire line is an arbitrary line—the line that divides the people on the Azad Kashmir side and the Jammu and Kashmir side—divides the same people and these people are Kashmiris who have the same blood, same culture, same language, same stock and you cannot infiltrate in your own home. The Kashmiri people on our side and on the side of territory held by India are people of the same stock, indivisible, inseparable, indistinguishable. You cannot call them infiltrators. Infiltrators can only come from outside. But these are people who are in their own homes. How can you commit aggression against your own people? You can only liberate your own people."

Answering another question on the same subject, the Foreign Minister said:

"The question here is that if there is a progressive movement towards the settlement of the Jammu and Kashmir dispute, then these armed soldiers would lay down arms because life is precious to everyone, precious to us Asians as to anyone else. In sheer desperation they have taken up arms and if they feel encouraged that they are moving towards an honourable and just settlement they themselves will feel inclined to lay down their arms."

Answering a question regarding the alleged training of the "infiltrators"

the Foreign Minister said:

"No, there is no such thing as infiltrators being trained but the question is that until and unless the Jammu and Kashmir dispute is settled, there will be tension in the sub-continent and we have to maintain our vigilance. But there is no such thing as training taking place in Pakistan to create trouble or to create difficulties for the Security Council to find a just and honourable settlement. We create no difficulties at all for anyone interested in a just and honourable settlement. On the contrary we will facilitate anyone interested in a just and honourable settlement, at the same time we will maintain our vigilance."

"We are not training any infiltrators. We don't have to train infiltrators. Why should we train infiltrators? If people are to fight for a just and honourable cause they will fight throughout the world, anywhere in the world. Do they need to be trained to do that thing. We are not training anyone."

"All I can say is that we will co-operate in every way to bring about a just and an honourable settlement of the dispute and these freedom-fighters—school children, people in universities—we have no control over them. They are the people of Kashmir who are fighting for their independence and for their freedom and at this rate you will have to withdraw five million people of Jammu and Kashmir and leave it completely as if it were a desert. That is not possible. After there is subversion, if there is tyranny in the State, there will be people who will fight subversion and tyranny and if people prefer to fight against suppression and tyranny, we believe that you will appreciate and sympathize with their difficulties and appreciate the sacrifices they are making."

Answering a question regarding the right to self-determination of the Kashmiris the Foreign Minister said:

"As you see, principles are indivisible and that is why Pakistan's policy is that we believe in self-determination, we believe in the implementation of international agreements, not only for the people of Jammu and Kashmir but wherever those principles are involved. That is why we feel so strongly on the question on any colonial issue, or any other matter which relates to self-determination of people. We cannot compromise on essentials."

Answering another question the Foreign Minister said:

"I think that is clear from the statements and it is not for India and Pakistan to interpret resolutions. If that was the case, the armed member states, each member state should vote, and if that was the position then there will be no need for the United Nations Charter and there will be no need for its resolutions. I think from the statements made by members of the Security Council on the 25th of October as well as this morning

it is quite clear what is the interpretation."

Answering an Indian correspondent the Foreign Minister said:

"Oh, I see if it is so, if people have gone to one part of Kashmir, I mean, it is a function, but in between functions, Kashmiris have gone into Kashmir. I'll not say that actually that position is a correct position. But in between so they cannot commit aggression against their own people; and there are Kashmiris on both sides of the cease-fire line. Eighteen years do not wipe out thousands of years' history. They do not change the temperament of the people, their character, their life, their culture. They are Kashmiris and eighteen years cannot make a difference in them. They don't become different people. I said that if that is a function."

Answering another question on the subject, the Foreign Minister said:

"I have not gone into details of the different issues that have been raised. I have just discussed the principle but each dispute has its own history. In the case of Jammu and Kashmir it is not a self-determination in a vacuum. This is a self-determination which has been sanctified by an international agreement between India and Pakistan."

Answering another question on the Kashmir dispute, the Foreign Minister said:

"No, each dispute has to be discussed on merits but general principles are there and at the same time general principles are subject to international agreements and subject to commitments. General principles that, we believe in self-determination, we believe in decolonization and what I mentioned. But then these can be subject to international agreements, resolutions of the United Nations or any other important consideration."

Answering another question on the same subject, the Foreign Minister said:

"Not a question of optimism. It is a question of conviction. It is a question of relentlessly and resolutely holding on to priniciples. It is a question of making sacrifices for the attainment of the objective. And we shall continue in our efforts. Whatever the sacrifices, whatever the liability, we will never abandon the people of Jammu and Kashmir under any circumstances. No question of optimism and we shall continue this for all times." (mixed voices). If you want to carry on...

No, no, I have got to leave tonight also... (Laughter) Mixed voices... Pakistan means the "land of the pure" (Laughter.)

known to the modern man, known to the contemporary times. This great principle was given tangible birth at the League of Nations by the great President of the United States, Woodrow Wilson, and it has since been a formidable instrument for the decolonization in the world. It is a principle to which we all subscribe. The Charter of the United Nations in its preamble and Article I refers to the right to self-determination to which all those states which are members of the United Nations have to subscribe. It is the great phenomenon that had swept across like the breath of fresh air in Asia and Africa. It is the principle to which all those countries which subscribe to the Bandung spirit and to the Bandung Charter must adhere.

So in the first place these countries supported the right to self-determination which is an uncompromising principle of modern man and of liberty and freedom. If liberty and freedom are to be the objectives of our times then it was natural for these countries to support the fight for freedom from Indian domination of the people of Kashmir.

Secondly Iran and those other countries supported the sanctity of international agreement. It would be even more chaotic and even more confused and even more terrifying in the world if sovereign states were to enter voluntarily into international agreement and then break them with impunity. It would mean the return of Hitlerite era in which international agreements and international obligations were made for unscrupulous ends. The world has evolved on the basis of the given word and commitments honourably made, and here again India has been a party to international agreement in broad day light voluntarily. They made a bilateral agreement with us that they would hold a plebiscite in the State of Kashmir, and they pledged to the United Nations and members of the United Nations that they would honour the right to self-determination of the people of Jammu and Kashmir. So the sanctity and the honour of international agreements of the sovereign states were at stake. I cannot conceive of my country entering into an international obligation to extricate itself out of it. I cannot conceive that situation to which my Government or my country should put the stamp of its sovereignty and then have audacity and temerity to wriggle out of it. It is inconceivable to the people of Pakistan. It is inconceivable for most civilized countries of the world, if they make an agreement without duress. So all the objective considerations were free and fair and impartial under which this agreement was drawn. India was completely free in entering into this agreement which it made with Pakistan bilaterally, so much so that it gave assurances to the people of Kashmir repeatedly ; they were given also right up to 1950 by Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru throughout the length and breadth of India and in the Lok Sabha and in telegrams to us and to the United Nations.

Thirdly the Kashmir dispute is a violation of the principle on which the sub-continent was partitioned, and that was also a voluntary agreement entered into by the leaders of India and Pakistan.

So three vital fundamental principles of international conduct and morality are involved. Right to self-determination which is independent of every other consideration, international agreement baptizing the right to self-determination of Kashmiri people, and thirdly the principle of partition voluntarily agreed to by Pakistan and India. To take a position on this basis is for a country to subscribe to the consolidation of international law, to the solidification of Bandung spirit, to the solidarity of under-developed nations, and to the amelioration of injustice. Kashmir dispute is not some subjective emotional romance between India and Pakistan on which peoples become subjectively pro-Pakistan or anti-India, and that is why we, a smaller country than India, received overwhelming support throughout the world. All the countries of Asia and Africa gave us support in some form or the other except one or two—I do not want to mention them, one of them hardly a state—who did not do so subsequently for their own subjective reasons.

Almost all the countries of Asia not only supported us but did so vigorously; and again I repeat, in the fore-front of this great movement to uphold the justice and honour and equity were the nations of Iran and Turkey.

Our country which is smaller than India—smaller than India in every respect *e.g.* in terms of resources, man-power, military capacity, industry—received overwhelming support from the world. Why? Because we withstood the habitual aggressor and defended our rights, our territory and our mother-land. It is a tribute to the people of Pakistan how they were able to defend their rights.

We have learnt many lessons from this crisis. Most important of them has been that the peoples throughout the world are willing to support a just cause. We are most grateful for this international support which was almost universal. We received catholic support from far flung countries of Latin America with whom we hardly have any diplomatic contact or association, countries like Argentine, Mexico, Uruguay and so many of them. We greatly cherished the support we received from our own family of Asia and Africa, apart from the peoples with whom we are inextricably interwoven and with whom our destinies are one. It was a great source of inspiration to the people of Pakistan that this support was forthcoming not only from the countries of Asia, Africa and Latin America but also from the countries of Europe, both Eastern and Western Europe. For example, France on the same basis had taken a just and correct position. Pakistan believes that France played an extremely constructive and exceptionally

important role. There were other such states in Europe and in Asia itself.

I think there is now better understanding in the Soviet Union of our position in our region, much better than it used to be in the past. I regard my visit to Moscow useful and constructive. We covered a range of subjects in a spirit of cordiality and, as you know, we have accepted the Soviet Union's good offices for the Tashkent talks, and we believe that India has also responded favourably to the proposal. We go to Tashkent with clean hands and a clear conscience, and we can look in the Indian eyes at any time because we are in the right, and therefore we are prepared to discuss the future of the State of Kashmir anywhere in the world. We are in fact happy that a great power, which is a neighbour of ours and directly interested in the peace of the sub-continent, has taken this initiative. We are thankful to the Soviet Union for its concern over the future of the sub-continent, concern for the maintenance of peace, and concern for a just and lasting settlement between India and Pakistan. We ourselves want a just and lasting settlement.

We do not gain by conflict. We are an under-developed country. We want to marshal our resources for the development of our country and well being of our people. We have been making considerable progress in the economic field, thanks mainly to the co-operation of the United States of America beside other countries. We had to work for our own economic progress vigorously with a sense of dedication and we hope to continue in this process but at the same time fundamental principles can not be compromised.

We can not abandon the cause of the people of Kashmir under any circumstances irrespective of the sacrifices we have to make, because their honour and destiny are the same as ours. In abandoning their cause we would actually be abandoning ourselves. It is not possible to do that for any consideration selfish or magnanimous. The people of Kashmir are inextricably a part of Pakistan being the kith and kin of the people of Pakistan, and their territory is therefore inseparable from Pakistan. Freak and fraud had brought them under Indian occupation. This freak and fraud must be removed. We shall continue our struggle no matter what are the consequences because we will not forsake our pledge. We will not betray the people of Kashmir.

With the United States, as you know, our relations are of special character, and our President is to leave for the United States about the 8th or 9th of this month for discussions with President Johnson. We hope that these discussions would lead to arrest some of the deterioration that had unfortunately taken place in our relations with the United States. We have the greatest respect and regard for that country which has made such handsome contribution to the development of our country and has stood by us

on so many occasions in the past. We are anxious to see that our relations with the United States are put back on an even keel and would be happy to see them restored. We believe it is possible without compromising fundamental interests of either country.

With the People's Republic of China we have most cordial relations. We are thankful to China for the support they gave us on a right and just cause. They are our great neighbours and we will maintain our cordial relations with them. We find not a grain of incompatibility in maintaining good and friendly relations with the People's Republic of China, with the Soviet Union, with the United States of America, with France, with Great Britain and with all the states of the world. Even though ideologies differ, one learns to live with peoples of different ideologies. One can learn to live in a world of a variety of differences. It is too big a world to be similar and identical, and it would be a colourless world if it were reduced to a common denominator. One can live in such *modus vivendi* and flexibility throughout the world.

If the principles are not firm then there is confusion. Ours is an ideological state. Pakistan came into existence on the basis of ideology. We have our own norms. We sacrificed millions of people to maintain and establish those norms. We have our own code of conduct and if we stick to it and make it the basis of our life we can live with the rest of the world no matter what are their bases of life. That is why it is compatible for us to maintain cordial relations with our immediate neighbours. It is the cardinal principle of our foreign policy to establish good relations with our neighbours for the simple reason that if you cannot live well with the men living next door you cannot hope to establish any good relations with the people living thousands and thousands of miles away. Among neighbours the irritants of day to day are their contacts. Therefore it is all the more necessary to have good relations with your neighbours so that the countries do not develop into irritants and troubles. The legacies of history had left behind defects which have to be removed through sincere and continuous efforts.

So working on this basis we have established very good relations with all our neighbours. In the highest category comes Iran with whom we have brotherly relations. With Nepal we have excellent relations. With Ceylon, with Indonesia we have the most fraternal relations; and we are most grateful to the people of Indonesia and the Government of Indonesia for the massive and inspired support they gave us. We have good relations with Afghanistan, which are further improving. There were some difficulties in the past with Afghanistan but thanks to the initiative taken by His Majesty's Government our relations are much better with our immediate neighbour to the north. We are now having good and improving

relations with the Soviet Union also whom we consider our good neighbour. We have good and cordial relations with China. Our relations with Burma also are very good.

Unfortunately with our principal neighbour India this has not been possible. But it is not that we have not tried. We have made many painstaking efforts to bring about good relations between India and Pakistan on the basis of equality and justice, and not on the application of double standard. We hope that India also, if it cannot establish good relations with Pakistan, would establish good relations with its other neighbours. I say that because if one tension is removed from our region it helps us. But India adds tension to tension. India adds dispute to dispute. India adds aggression to aggression. India adds friction to friction. If it could start reducing tension one by one, even then perhaps we would be able to get less of its fire, wrath and anger. We hope that India would improve her relations with all her neighbours. It is all known to you what are the problems of India with its neighbours. It is not for me to speak of India's problems with its neighbours.

You all know that recently the Prince or King of a neighbouring state of India, which is regarded by India as its dependency—it is strange that Asian countries should have dependencies, but India claims two dependencies *i.e.* feudal states—said in an interview to a foreign correspondent in Switzerland that since 1947 India had created so many problems for all its neighbours. Surely India was not right and all those people wrong. There must be something wrong somewhere. This statement he made in a reference to the Kashmir dispute.

So we stand for good and normal relations with India. But we would like to establish them on the basis of mutual respect, non-interference, implementation of international agreement, recognition of the right to self-determination and respect for the principles of partnership.

I am sorry if I have taken so long. Any questions please?

Answers to Questions

In answer to a question about the date of the Tashkent meeting the Foreign Minister said:

"I do not think a firm date has been fixed but I believe it will be, if I may guess, some time in January depending on being acceptable to the three countries and mutually convenient to the Soviet Union, to us and India."

Replying to various questions probing Pakistan's dis-satisfaction with CENTO, the Foreign Minister said:

"While we are member of CENTO, if we found any fundamental defects in it we would not be in CENTO. I will not say anything more

than that. I will say there are undoubtedly difficulties that arise in a given situation, which have to be examined and considered. But in the dynamics of the present situation it is more important to analyse these things properly rather than to pass any quick judgement on them."

Replying to a correspondent's question as to what was expected to be achieved at Tashkent, the Foreign Minister said:

"Well the question here is that I do not think it would be right for me to analyse the prospects and give prognosis of the meeting before it is held. We are concerned with the dispute. It has to be settled on the basis of self-determination. We have sought it from the very beginning whenever an avenue has opened for a peaceful settlement whether it is through the United Nations or outside it; and we will continue to uphold the struggle. If this meeting makes some progress well and good; and if it does not, it will not dishearten us. We are not going to abandon our efforts."

Replying to a question about the status of Jammu and Kashmir, the Foreign Minister said:

"It is my firm conviction that Jammu and Kashmir is a part of Pakistan. It is a freak and fraud of history that it is in the occupation of India. Sooner or later it will have to come to us. It is part and parcel of Pakistan. Its people are part of us through history, through communication, through geography, through rivers, through faith, through belief, through culture, through lives and everything. It is as much part of Pakistan as any other part of Pakistan."

When questioned about the development programmes of SEATO and CENTO countries, the Foreign Minister said:

"I do not know what efforts the other countries in the SEATO are making. Such efforts are in the unilateral field and in the multilateral field. Whatever progress CENTO countries are making, they are on their own resources."

Replying to a question as to what part the Soviets will play in Tashkent meeting, the Foreign Minister said:

"It has not been defined. The original offer as made to us by the Soviet Prime Minister gives the impression that there would be Soviet presence. What kind of presence that would be is a different question altogether. But here again I would like to anticipate that it would be much better to leave the thing flexible because if President Ayub and Prime Minister Shastri discuss the matter among themselves and come to some results there is nothing like it. If they require some assistance considering that little prop here and little modest support somewhere else by a third party is needed and would be constructive, then we will see how the situation develops. It is much better to see how the events

develop."

Regarding discussions in Rumania the Foreign Minister said:

"Yes. I would say this much that we had very useful discussions with the leaders of Rumania. I met the President, the Prime Minister and the Foreign Minister. We had many discussions on our bilateral relations and on a number of international disputes; and we returned home from Rumania most satisfied."

Continuing he said :

"We discussed economic collaboration and there was some discussion on this subject as well."

Regarding discussions with Shahinshah of Iran the Foreign Minister said:

"Yes. I had discussions this morning with His Majesty and he was very kind to receive me for an hour and a quarter. I thanked him on behalf of my Government and the people of Pakistan for the honourable position that his country took. We discussed the Tashkent meeting in detail."

Replying to a question whether Pakistan had advised Iran to recognize the People's Republic of China, the Foreign Minister said:

"No. That is the sovereign right of every country. I believe other CENTO countries surely mean only Iran and Turkey. Iran and Turkey have been independent for a longer time than we have been. They have culture and civilization as ancient as we have. So how we can be presumptuous. How we can advise what they should do. Urge is dictatorial."

When questioned about the position of SEATO and CENTO in recent Indian aggression against Pakistan the Foreign Minister said:

"It is somewhat academic, this question you raise. As far as SEATO is concerned and the United States, it is stipulated in the protocol to the Treaty—and the Treaty is an open book and it is a registered document—that aggression means communist aggression, aggression by a communist state. That is how far the SEATO is concerned. As far as CENTO is concerned that does not stipulate any condition. There aggression is to be taken to mean from any quarter. United States is not a member of CENTO but it participates in the CENTO meetings. However, the question here is that if there is no definition of aggression then in CENTO it is aggression from any quarter. Aggression requires some action. What that action is, is a different question altogether. It requires some collaboration, some form of association, and that can take various forms; but here the United States is not a member of CENTO. We can look at the position. That is now aggression from any quarter. If aggression comes from somewhere else it should be resisted. Aggression means destruction, aggression means terror, aggression means

upheaval, aggression means slaughter; all forms of aggression have to be resisted. We had to fight all sorts of aggression. United Nations, the League of Nations or any other organization had been formed to resist aggression. From that point of view, in the last eighteen years, unfortunately, India committed one aggression after another, in Junagadh, in Manavadar, then in Hyderabad, then again in the case of Jammu and Kashmir, then again in the case of Goa. And now India again made a wanton attack on Lahore and Sialkot on the 6th of September. This time India has committed aggression that will make the man like Changez Khan envious."

Replying to a question relating to help given by Iran and Turkey, the Foreign Minister said:

"Iran and Turkey helped us. They gave us moral support. They sent material help to us."

Regarding Britain the Foreign Minister said:

"Mr. Wilson expressed his shock over the attack on Lahore."

In reply to a question by D.P.P. correspondent whether India was the aggressor in Sino-India border clash of 1962, the Foreign Minister said:

"It was in 1962 and this is 1965. Three years have passed. Various treatises have been written on it. A representative of *the New York Times* said that India started the fighting with China. General Maxwell Taylor, in a testimony before the Committee of House or Senate, blamed India. He has said that India started the fighting. There have been many books written on it. Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru himself said in Madras that he had ordered his troops to throw out the Chinese. He then went to Ceylon where the Ceylonese Prime Minister, Mrs. Bandaranaike, said that he was making a dangerous statement. Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru replied that his army was in the position to throw them out."

When asked about the message he delivered to Shahinshah, the Foreign Minister said:

"I brought the greetings and good wishes of our President. No form of letter. No."

When again asked about CENTO, the Foreign Minister said:

"I have answered sufficient questions on CENTO. I think I will say the basic thing that Pakistan is still a member of CENTO, but I would not like to go into any discussion on this subject."

In answer to a question whether in view of recent events Pakistan was still a member of CENTO the Foreign Minister said:

"Still we are a member of CENTO."

Answering a question about the help and support given by Iran and appreciation of that help by Pakistan, the Foreign Minister emphasised:

"I have made that position very clear. I will leave no doubt in any

one's mind that we carry a debt and obligation to the Iranian nation and Iranian Government personified by His Majesty. We have many weaknesses but we do not forget the obligations, and we shall be mindful of it and remember it for all times."

When questioned about the possible solutions of the dispute, the Foreign Minister said:

"We are reckoning with many possibilities. We are reckoning with the Security Council. We may go to the General Assembly. There are certain other possibilities and are naturally under consideration. We did not start it. If India starts we will respond to it. India is committing genocide in Kashmir. Over 150,000 people have come into Pakistan from across the cease-fire line, mainly women. Youngmen are killed, the women are generally abducted and taken to other parts of India, villages destroyed. All the prominent leaders of Jammu and Kashmir are behind the bars. Sheikh Abdullah has languished for eleven years in imprisonment. We had said in the Security Council that we are prepared for any one to visit the scene, official or non-official, in any capacity, from any part of the world, to come and see the reign of terror, the genocide that has taken place in the State of Kashmir under Indian secular democracy."

In reply to a question about the United States the Foreign Minister said:

"The United States has its own so many difficulties and I would not like to dilate on them."

When asked about the position of the United States in Vietnam, the Foreign Minister said:

"I will explain but you can put it in your own words. For one thing, this word 'Vietnam' has made the US as well as the Chinese temper very sensitive. But no war can last for ever and we hope this dreadful and unfortunate war will come to an end. I will not go into the merit of this conflict. It must come to an end. No war can last for all times. We believe that when this happens the Chinese and the United States differences will remain. It is not that they will be washed away. There are differences of ideologies between China and the United States, but the temper will calm down and there will be more realistic relationship between the two countries. Already we have seen the People's Republic of China almost in the United Nations this year. Next year it may be a member of the United Nations. In the disarmament negotiations the United States had not opposed the participation of People's Republic of China. It is a significant development. There are now people in the United States talking about the need for a more realistic approach towards China and American policy in Vietnam and South-East Asia."

Statement on Tashkent Declaration in Larkana on January 15, 1966

I have learnt with deep concern and anguish the misgivings caused by the Tashkent Declaration. The President addressed the nation yesterday. He specifically assured the people of Pakistan that we will continue to support the inalienable right of the people of Jammu and Kashmir to decide their own future.

Referring to the feeling among certain sections of the people, the President said: "I am fully aware of their misgivings and honour the sentiments which give rise to them."

In considering the Declaration of Tashkent, it is well to remember that in the brief history of their existence as independent, sovereign states, Pakistan and India have many a time attempted to settle disputes through negotiations. The Liaquat-Nehru Pact was one such agreement. It may also be recalled that a settlement of the Jammu and Kashmir dispute itself is the subject of an agreement between the two countries as embodied in the two Resolutions of the United Nations Council on India and Pakistan dated 13 August, 1948 and 5 January, 1949. This agreement relates to the method of a free and impartial plebiscite under the aegis of the United Nations to enable the people of the State to decide the future affiliation and allegiance of their homeland.

If, despite an international agreement, freely negotiated and mutually accepted, relations between the two countries failed to improve, and indeed, never ceased to deteriorate, it is not because of their incapacity to settle the dispute but because of India's failure to implement honourably the agreement reached freely and in good faith.

The fundamental importance of resolving this dispute was stressed by

the President in his opening statement at Tashkent on the 4th of January when he declared that unless we address ourselves to the resolution of the cause of conflict between India and Pakistan we would only be contending with the semblance of peace and not its substance.

Peace and justice are inseparable in the creed of Islam. Peace without honour is indeed inconceivable and repugnant to the tenets of our ideology. History is not deficient in instances where mere professions of peace have been overtaken by events resulting from the continuance of injustice and inequity. Words are no substitute for intents. If, in reality, injustice should persist, then peaceful declarations by themselves would not prevent tension or avert conflict.

The Tashkent Declaration is to be judged in its totality and against the historic background of our struggle for justice in Jammu and Kashmir. It is to be tested with regard to intent which is the ultimate determiner of all accords. The realities of the situation invariably pierce through all perverse, biased and prejudiced interpretations of the words of any document.

In the implementation of the Tashkent Declaration, its spirit as well as its specific provisions demand progress towards a settlement of all disputes particularly the basic dispute over Jammu and Kashmir.

Peace is not made of words but of actions. The spectre of war and conflict can vanish only when a lasting peace is achieved by allowing the people of Jammu and Kashmir their right to determine freely their future. The struggle of the people of Jammu and Kashmir is based on the great movement of people for emancipation, equality and progress, which has marked the history of this century. The great state on the soil of which the conference took place, the Union of Socialist Soviet Republics, came into being as a result of a mighty historic movement based on the principles of equality of man and self-determination of peoples.

Historically and ideologically, the commitments of the Soviet Union to these ideals are irrevocable. The Soviet Union was itself conceived with struggle against the forces of oppression. The people of the Soviet Union have waged a heroic and ceaseless struggle against domination and exploitation. They have written a glorious chapter in the annals of human history by their resolute defence against aggression and by their successful war against human bondage.

It would be a fitting tribute to the Soviet Union if its initiative were to result in a significant contribution to the realization of the legitimate aspirations of the people of Jammu and Kashmir, who have waged such a valiant struggle for their liberty. The Soviet leaders were no doubt mindful of their own rich heritage as fighters for freedom and liberty when they agreed at Tashkent that a solution of the Jammu and Kashmir dispute must be found.

Pakistan was itself founded on the principle of self-determination. The

day must come when the people of Jammu and Kashmir will be enabled to decide their fate and their future in freedom and without coercion. The struggle in Jammu and Kashmir is between self-determination and alien domination, between freedom and oppression. What is at issue is not any territorial claim of Pakistan against the claim of India or the conflicting interpretations of an agreement, but the right of the people of Jammu and Kashmir to decide their own future. Pakistan cannot be privy to any action which militates against this concept and commitment.

The U.N. Charter which represents the collective resolve of the world community to perpetuate peace, in Article 51 recognizes the ultimate right of a nation to wage its struggle for freedom. It is precisely in this context that in the Tashkent Declaration we have reaffirmed our obligations under the Charter. The fact that we were unable to arrive immediately at a settlement in Tashkent does not detract one iota from our resolve to seek a just settlement under this very Declaration or even outside its framework.

The Tashkent Declaration is not an end in itself and cannot by itself represent a turning point in our relations with India. The slate can only be sponged clean when the people of Jammu and Kashmir have exercised their inherent right to self-determination, and there can be no doubt or ambiguity about it. The Tashkent Declaration resumed the dialogue between India and Pakistan. But no amount of platitudes or polemics can substitute or detract from the imperative need for a permanent settlement of the tragic dispute over Jammu and Kashmir.

In the ultimate analysis it is the determination of the people of Pakistan and their willingness to make sacrifices that will prevail over all forces pitted against this nation in its resolve to uphold justice and honour.

The blood of our martyrs is dedicated to the supreme pursuit of a peace based on justice and not a purchased peace. Their sacrifices shall not be in vain, nor shall we fail to be worthy of those who died for us.

For eighteen years the Jammu and Kashmir dispute has waxed and waned until only a few years ago it virtually lay frozen in the U.N. It is no more now a dead issue. Not only has the dispute been reactivated but because of the people of Jammu and Kashmir has been resurrected, and the world community as a whole made aware of the imperative need for restoration of their rights. The great powers recognized the far-reaching implications of the dispute.

Is it not a tribute to the struggle of Pakistan that, as never before in the history of Islam, the solidarity of the *Millat* was manifested so clearly from the shores of the *Maghreb* to the water of South East Asia. The Arabs, the Iranians, the Turks and the Indonesians have all demonstrated their unanimous support of Pakistan in its just struggle against the continued denial to the people of Jammu and Kashmir of their inalienable right to

self-determination.

The Afro-Asian and Latin American communities have also demonstrated their solidarity with us and made it quite clear that the people of Jammu and Kashmir cannot be treated as an exception to the rule of emancipation and freedom which constitutes the very essence of our contemporary political movement.

This then is the basic truth and it can never be eclipsed no matter how grave the vicissitudes or how far-reaching the challenge and the crisis.

Statement on Tashkent Declaration in Larkana on February 9, 1966

Some Opposition leaders met recently in Lahore to consider the ramifications of the Tashkent Declaration. Although internal and external factors are closely interlinked, there is, nevertheless, a dividing line between them. It is, therefore, necessary to take this dividing line into full account in formulating national attitudes. Generally, the external policies of a country require a unitary and a national approach. In the recent past, during national emergency, Government had consulted Opposition leaders. During the Consortium crisis the leaders and the members of the Opposition parties in the National Assembly were taken into confidence and their point of view was given adequate respect and consideration. The Opposition leaders and the members in the National Assembly appreciated this initiative of the Government. During the September war the President held consultations with the leaders of the Opposition. We were able to surmount the gravest national crisis on account of the magnificent unity demonstrated by the entire nation. During the President's visit to East Pakistan the Opposition leaders of that wing of the country met the President and held profitable discussions with him on a number of vital national problems. There is no denying that the country is still going through a period of grave national crisis and it is in the fitness of things that we pool our ideas to overcome the existing challenge. It is, therefore, essential in confronting the present serious crisis to pursue the path of meaningful dialogues rather than to move in different directions. The answer to the present situation will be more readily available if the different points of view are articulated in such a way as to be able to produce concrete and tangible suggestions to Government to enable the nation to proceed in a spirit of mutual

co-operation and harmony and to maintain the strongest national cohesion in the resolution of fundamental issues.

We are aware of the apprehensions sincerely entertained by some people that the Tashkent Declaration will not be honoured in its letter and spirit and that once again the people of the State of Kashmir will be prevented from the exercise of their inherent right to decide freely the future of their homeland in accordance with their wishes. In my statement of 15 January, 1966 I expressed my understanding of the deep concern and anguish which the people of this country entertain at the plight and fate of their brethren in Occupied Jammu and Kashmir. From the very beginning, Kashmir is not and never has been a party issue. It is a question which concerns the entire nation, and with its resolution are bound the safety and integrity of Pakistan itself. Let me repeat what I said in my first statement on the subject: "The Tashkent Declaration is to be judged in its totality and against the historic background of our struggle for justice in Jammu and Kashmir. It is to be tested with regard to intent which is the ultimate determiner of all accords."

It was at no time asserted that the Tashkent Declaration constitutes a settlement of the Kashmir dispute. The Tashkent Declaration provides yet another frame-work within which the pursuit for a just and honourable solution of the Kashmir dispute will be continued. In its quest for a final settlement of this dispute, Pakistan has shown a dedication to peaceful procedures of settlement of disputes. Otherwise we would not have laboured so sedulously in the United Nations for almost two decades. If today we have agreed with India under the auspices of the Soviet Union to make a fresh effort towards seeking a peaceful solution of the Jammu and Kashmir dispute on a just and honourable basis, this constitutes not a departure from the traditional policy consistently followed from the beginning but another step in the same direction.

It is incorrect to assert that, because the two countries have re-affirmed their obligations under the Charter to seek a solution through peaceful means, the fate of the people of Kashmir has been sealed or that Pakistan has abandoned their cause.

For eighteen years the people of Kashmir, supported by their brethren in Pakistan, have waged a ceaseless and unremitting struggle for the achievement of their inherent right. They have braved bullets and risked their all in a struggle which goes back to even before partition. Their determination has not wavered in the face of obstacles and difficulties. Twice within this period Pakistan has shown itself ready to face war and sufferings in their cause. Pakistan shall not and cannot abandon its sacred pledge to the people of Kashmir.

The people of Kashmir are our brothers and our kin. It is inconceivable

for anyone to think that we can go back on our solemn pledge to assist them in their liberation. It is the corner-stone of Pakistan's policy and has been re-affirmed in the clearest manner and on many occasions by the President.

The President has made it clear time and again as he did in his discussions with the late Lal Bahadur Shastri at Tashkent that a durable edifice of peace in the sub-continent can only be built on the foundation of a just and honourable settlement of the Kashmir dispute. Throughout the duration of the Tashkent Conference, Kashmir was virtually the sole subject of discussion between Pakistan and the Soviet leaders, as well as between Pakistan and India. This fact is recorded in the very first article of the Tashkent Declaration, the language of which makes it clear that the dispute over Jammu and Kashmir is connected with the issue of war and peace. In re-affirming their obligations under the Charter to refrain from the use of force and to settle the dispute through peaceful means, the two countries have done no more than re-state their existing international commitments under the Charter. This dispute has been on the agenda of the Security Council for eighteen years. It was under the aegis of the United Nations that the two countries entered in an agreement to settle the dispute peacefully through a free and impartial plebiscite. It is patently contrary to the facts to suggest that re-affirmation by the two countries of their obligations under the Charter implies a retreat on the obligations and commitments entered into by the two countries in respect of the state of Kashmir. It is equally incorrect to assert that the mutual consent to refrain from interference in the internal affairs of each other can be considered to apply to the disputed territory of Jammu and Kashmir. Pakistan obviously does not consider the State of Kashmir as an integral part of India, for if that were so, there would have been no need of protracted discussions on the subject at Tashkent at all.

For Pakistan, a just and honourable settlement of the Kashmir dispute remains the only path towards the goal of a lasting peace and relationship of true cordiality between the two countries and their peoples. The world too has recognized that peace cannot be brought in the sub-continent on a basis of expediencies and injustice. Let us not, therefore, ignore the substance and chase after the shadow. Let us not, at this critical stage in our affairs, engage in mutual recriminations. This nation stands firm in its resolve to uphold justice and honour. The people of Pakistan have shown by their determination and steadfastness that they will not flinch in the face of obstacles or be deflected from their just cause by the threat or use of force.

In the face of war, the people of Pakistan gave the world an example of unity. Today we are faced with the more difficult challenge of peace. I am convinced that in facing this challenge, we shall show faith and firmness

of purpose.

I would like to re-emphasize that the issue of Jammu and Kashmir is a national issue. The cause of our brothers in Occupied Kashmir is sacred to all of us, from the President of the nation to the humblest citizen of this country. The matter is not one on which there are any differences amongst political parties or between the two wings of the country.

We have just emerged from the ordeal of war, but the trials of the nation and all our kinsmen across the cease-fire line are not over. In the troubled time which lies ahead we must all stand together. As it did during the war, the Government look to all the people for support and strength in achieving the goal for which this nation was created and for the vindication of the inherent and just right of the people of Jammu and Kashmir.

Political relations require that fundamental matters such as the future of the State of Jammu and Kashmir should be pursued in an indomitable spirit and on a collective and indivisible basis. Any other approach would not be conducive to the attainment of the supreme objective.

PART VIII

MISCELLANEOUS SPEECHES

Message-in-Reply at the First Anniversary of the Pakistan-China Boundary Agreement on March 2, 1964

I have the honour to acknowledge Your Excellency's message of today conveying the congratulations of the Government and people of China on the first anniversary of the conclusion of the Pakistan-China Boundary Agreement.

While warmly reciprocating your message on behalf of the Government and people of Pakistan, may I take this occasion to affirm that the boundary agreement is regarded by us also as an important milestone in the establishment of good-neighbourly relations with China. We are happy at the progress in the work of boundary demarcation which is proceeding in a co-operative and friendly atmosphere.

The settlement of this question is a testimony to the spirit of goodwill and harmony that governs the relations between Pakistan and China. It demonstrates further that territorial differences between nations can be resolved peacefully, provided both sides sincerely desire it. Such agreements not only promote friendly relations between neighbouring countries in keeping with the Bandung principles, but also constitute a positive contribution to the cause of world peace.

I am confident that the friendly relations between our countries will endure.

Address to the Preparatory Meeting of the Second Asian-African Conference in Djakarta on April 11, 1964

It is indeed a great honour for Pakistan, one of the original sponsors of the First Asian-African Conference, to participate in the preparatory meeting of the Second Asian-African Conference. May I thank you again, Mr. Chairman, and the President of the Republic of Indonesia, His Excellency Dr. Soekarno, for the warm welcome and gracious hospitality which my delegation has received from the Government and the people of Indonesia.

Mr. Chairman, it is my privilege to bring to this conference the greetings and good wishes of my President, Field-Marshal Mohammad Ayub Khan and his prayers for the success of our endeavours.

If we are gathered here today to make the necessary arrangements for the convening of the Second Asian-African Conference it is in a large measure due to the initiative of the President, the Government and the great people of Indonesia who have since 1955 been making unremitting effort to bring about a consummation of this event.

Mr. Chairman, we are fully aware that the cause of the Asian-African solidarity is very dear to your President who has always attached great importance to a conference of Asian-African countries. When the President of Pakistan visited Indonesia in December 1960 the two Chiefs of State discussed the question of holding an Asian-African Conference at the earliest possible time. During his memorable visit to Pakistan in June 1963 President Soekarno again discussed the question with the President of Pakistan and both of them reiterated their conviction that if a major role was to be played by the Asian-African countries in world affairs then it was essential to hold second conference at an early date.

Mr. Chairman, as the First Vice-Prime Minister and Foreign Minister

of Indonesia you have shown remarkable initiative and courage in the face of many obstacles to bring us together at this conference table in order that the time and place of the Second Asian-African Conference and other related matters may be decided in a spirit of Asian-African solidarity.

We have met together here in this burgeoning capital city of Indonesia to further promote and strengthen the cause of intercontinental solidarity and co-operation in order to eradicate the remaining vestiges of colonialism and imperialism in all their manifestations old and new, to aid and comfort the people who still remain dependent in their struggles and ordeals for freedom and independence to give a greater impetus to the economic development of our peoples and to their cultural renaissance.

We are called upon to accomplish these tasks within the framework of the principles of the famous declaration of the Bundung Conference on the promotion of world peace and co-operation in terms of the ten principles, or in the words of President Soekarno, the "Dasa Sila" in order to contribute effectively to the maintenance and promotion of world peace and security, and to ensure compliance with the high purposes and principles of the Charter of the United Nations.

Yesterday we heard from the President of Indonesia an original, inspiring and eloquent address which revealed a new dimension to the intercontinental efforts that we the peoples of Asia and Africa are pledged to make to recover for ourselves and succeeding generations our lost heritage and to re-shape our future destiny.

He urged us to see the world in the light of a new perspective, to look forward to a new objective of building a new world, a new order of the brotherhood of man, wherein justice may prevail in ever-widening freedom.

In these words, President Soekarno has invoked as the ends of human endeavour the most sublime and sacred ideal that the spiritual and moral nature of man could evolve for the race of mankind. This is the goal which the great religions and civilizations of Asia and Africa have proclaimed to be the destiny of man on this earth *i.e.*, his salvation and his triumph over the forces of destruction which beset him on every side.

Let the world note that this is no counsel of exclusiveness. His is not a message of domination. It is not a call for segregation. Africa and Asia beckon to all nations and all peoples of the world to choose equality and flee greed, to practise tolerance and turn from hate, to bury animosity and embrace brotherhood.

It is in this spirit that we deliberate upon the arrangements that should be made for convening a Second Asian-African Conference in order to rededicate ourselves to the struggle for freedom, peace and justice for all men and all nations.

The First Afro-Asian Conference was held in Bandung nine years ago.

It was a truly remarkable event because the leaders of twenty-nine African and Asian states, representing half of mankind, found it possible to agree on the attainment of certain common objectives. Notwithstanding certain differences between themselves, they were able, on the basis of their common experience of colonial rule and its vile legacies and also of their shared aspirations for the future, to devise a framework of Asian-African co-operation.

These included issues involved in the promotion of world peace, the strengthening of the United Nations, disarmament and the prohibition of nuclear weapons under effective international control, a halt to nuclear weapons tests and the ten principles of peaceful co-existence and friendly co-operation between states.

The First Asian-African Conference also concerned itself with other problems involving the principles of human rights and self-determination to which it extended its fullest support. In particular, it called for the restoration of the rights of the Arab people of Palestine and the implementation of the UN resolutions. It supported Indonesia's position in the case of West Irian on the basis of relevant agreements, and also the position of Yemen in the case of Aden and the Southern Arabian Protectorates. The Bandung Conference also supported the right to self-determination and the independence of Morocco, Tunisia and Algeria.

In regard to the problems of dependent peoples and colonialism the First Asian-African Conference condemned colonialism in all its manifestations as an evil which should be speedily rooted out. It pledged resolute support to the cause of freedom and independence of all dependent peoples and called upon the powers concerned to grant freedom and independence to languishing dependent peoples. It denounced racial segregation and discrimination, and in particular, the policies of 'apartheid' of the Government of South Africa, and it re-affirmed the determination of the Asian-African peoples to eradicate every trace of such policies and practices. It called for fuller economic, cultural and political co-operation between the Asian-African countries on the basis of equally mutual benefit and mutual respect for national sovereignty.

During the nine years that have elapsed since these declarations were made, many radical changes have taken place in the world. The threat of nuclear war though not removed has receded appreciably; the rising tide of the East-West cold war has begun to ebb; there has been a radical change in the relations between and within the two opposing power blocs, and an undeclared and tacit agreement has resulted between the two sides to turn away from war and to accept the imperative need of co-existence.

For peaceful co-existence, a Nuclear Test Ban Treaty has been signed. Rigid positions in regard to measures of disarmament and control in the context of negotiations on a treaty for general and complete disarmament

have to some degree become flexible.

The United Nations has emerged strengthened through several crises, notably those of the Suez and the Congo, some of which rocked it to its foundations. It has become much more universal with the admission of the newly independent Asian and African states.

In consequence of the fact that the line separating the two blocs has become blurred and with it the rivalries and acerbities between the contending groups have subsided, the substance and meaning of alignment and non-alignment have been trasformed.

The principles of human rights and self-determination of peoples have been successfully asserted and vindicated in the African continent during the last nine years. Morocco, Tunisia, Algeria and other African states have won their struggles for freedom and independence. Pakistan played its role in sustaining strength and courage in their ordeals. Indonesia was able to vindicate its position in regard to West Irian in accordance with relevant international agreements. My country is gratified that it was able, through the Pakistan military contingent in the role of a UN security force, to assist in the peaceful transfer of sovereignty and administration from the Netherlands to Indonesia.

Even more impressive than these great political changes since the Bandung Conference is the almost complete change in the political map of Africa. Within the span of but five years the vibrant African peoples from one end of that continent to the other upreared their giant limbs and smote and severed the colonial chains which had shackled them for nearly a century. Their collective strength has made them a major political and moral force in the counsels of the United Nations and governments of the world.

The emergence of the Organization for African Unity is a major event, and it bears witness to the irresistible African urge to unity and continental solidarity for the promotion of equality, freedom and peace in the world. Never has there been such an accession of power and strength by the struggle of the peoples of the world against the evil forces of colonialism and the inhuman doctrines and practices of racial discrimination and apartheid as manifested in the successful assertion of the African will to sovereignty and independence.

The Bandung spirit and the intercontinental solidarity which was promoted in the First Asian-African Conference has made no insignificant contribution to this impressive march of freedom in the world, but we must acknowledge that first and foremost it is to their own liberation struggle and to the sacrifices which were made to sustain them that the peoples of Africa owe their independence.

In the economic field, the Asian-Africans have made remarkable progress in providing and establishing for their countries the economic base in

structure as well as in promoting industrialization to raise the standard of living of their peoples from pitifully low levels.

The Second Asian-African Conference must, of course, take note of these great political and economic changes in the world and more especially in their own continents.

There is no doubt these changes give us legitimate satisfaction. But many of our hopes and expectations remain to be realised. Our major goal and aspiration still delude us. It must be the task of that conference to chart our course for their attainment. The total disarmament both nuclear and conventional, under effective international control including the questions of holding under-ground tests and proliferation of nuclear weapons, must continue to remain a foremost concern of the countries of Asia and Africa. The equitable and adequate representation of our peoples in all the organs of the United Nations and its specialized agencies must be effected without any further delay to enable our governments to exercise their equal rights and make their due contribution to the promotion of the aims of these international organizations. The cause of universality of the UN Charter has yet to be attained. To this end the People's Republic of China must be enabled to take its rightful place in the United Nations to enable it to try the accession of its great strength to the United Nations and the cause of peace.

The time has come to appraise the observance and implementation or otherwise of the ten principles of peaceful co-existence and friendly co-operation that were proclaimed by the Bandung Conference in 1955, including those pertaining to the recognition of the equality of all races and of the equality of all nations large and small, acceptance of the right of each nation to defend itself singly or collectively in conformity with the Charter of the United Nations refraining from acts or threats of aggression, avoidance of the use of force against the territorial integrity or political independence of any country, settlement of all international disputes by peaceful means such as negotiations, conciliation, arbitration or judicial settlement as well as other peaceful means in conformity of the Charter of the United Nations, and respect for justice and international obligations.

It is not necessary for me to set forth the reasons for suggesting that the Second Asian-African Conference should include in its agenda a review of the Ten Bandung Principles. Distinguished delegates are fully aware of the need for undertaking their assessment in the light of the developments of the last decade and the experience we have gained of the extent of their observance or breach.

The President of Indonesia in his brilliant address yesterday looked forward to the day when Asian-African problems will be solved by Asia and Africa in an Asian-African way. We pay a tribute to African nations for

having had the foresight and sense of continental solidarity to establish the machinery of the OAU to find peaceful solutions of inter-African disputes. No such machinery has been devised by Asian nations. Pakistan shall continue to struggle to find an adequate machinery besides the UN for the effective and honourable settlement of disputes which threaten our security and peace. In this respect we look forward to our renewed and emboldened efforts at the next conference with particular eagerness. Until then we of Asia must perforce repose our hopes and expectations of peaceful settlement of inter-Asian disputes in the United Nations.

In the context of the developments which have taken place since 1955 are also those which to our profound regret and anguish have brought no measure of redress to the outraged Arabs of Palestine and to the peoples of the remaining pockets of colonialism in Africa. The UN resolutions on Palestine like that on another important dispute affecting us remain unimplemented.

Angola and Mozambique are territories in Africa calling for our continuing concern and support in their struggle for freedom.

Pakistan will stand stead-fast behind those people who are waging their battle for the overthrow of colonialism and racial discrimination.

The Government of South Africa could not be persuaded or deflected from its inhuman policies of 'apartheid'. We support the sustained and effective applications of sanctions against South Africa in accordance with the resolutions of the Security Council and the General Assembly of the United Nations. We also comdemn the inhuman atrocities to which thousands of political prisoners have been subjected by the South African authorities. While the policies of 'apartheid' are kindling the embers of fear and hate in Africa, a new kind of 'apartheid' discrimination based on differences of religion and caste are poisoning the air of Asia. A serious note must be taken of these discriminatory policies and effort must be made to overcome them.

The First Asian-African Conference recognized the urgency of promoting the economic development of the Asian-African region, and to this end made a number of recommendations relating to the pattern of trade stabilization of prices of primary commodities and international financial and technical assistance. The World Trade and Development Conference, which is currently meeting in Geneva, is seized of all these and other important related matters. President Soekarno cited to us facts and figures to prove conclusively how despite foreign capital and technical assistance the developing countries are not in fact any richer and are becoming poorer in relation to the developed countries. This realization is the basic reality behind the Geneva conference.

President Ayub Khan was among the first to draw world attention to the

threat posed to the economic future of developing countries by the advent of exclusive common markets of continental proportions.

The Pakistan delegation is of the view that the Second Asian-African Conference must undertake an appraisal of the result of the Geneva conference and consider what further steps should be taken to find solutions to the basic economic problems of the Asian-African countries. As a matter of fact experts from our countries can undertake this examination even before the Asian-African Conference. Their report can be placed before the main conference as an important working paper.

Turning from the question of agenda of the Second Asian -African Conference to the representation of all independent states of Asia and Africa, which participated in the Bandung Conference, and all other Asian-African nations which have acceded to independence since 1955 and are entitled to be invited, we consider that Northern Rhodesia and Nyasaland are also qualified to participate in the Asian-African Conference. When it is held, we would join with other delegations in welcoming these newly independent states to the African-Asian family. We look with great hopes and expectations to the contribution that the African states will undoubtedly be able to make to the success of the second conference. As to the date of the conference, I can do no better than to quote President Soekarno: "Seize then our time. Seize then our opportunity, and with God's blessing we shall speed the world upon its revolutionary way."

We agree with the President of Indonesia. The conference should be convened as soon as possible consistent with the time and effort needed to make it one of the greatest congresses of our time.

The first conference was held here in Asia. In accordance with the general desire of African delegations we will welcome the second conference being held in an African capital.

Mr. Chairman, revolutionary changes are taking place in the world. They present a great challenge to the people of Asia and Africa. The issues of peace and war, of plenty and poverty, of the oppressed waging the struggle against their oppressors, of the explioted against exploiters, of the weak against the strong, await urgent solution. The challenge is formidable. Let us meet it. Together we can overcome it.

May the Second Asian-African Conference demonstrate to the world that the leadership of Asia and Africa inspired by their peoples have both the vision and the will to establish a better world order.

Interview with the APP on the United States Long Term Military Aid to India on June 13, 1964

Question: Will you comment on the wisdom of the recent decision by the United States Government, as announced through a joint communique issued in Washington and New Delhi, to grant massive military aid to India on long-term basis.

Answer: There is hardly any need for me to comment on the wisdom of the long-term military assistance to India by the United States, I say this because ever since the Sino-Indian flare-up of about two years ago we in Pakistan made it quite clear that the long-term military assistance is not in the interest of the stability of the sub-continent and the entire continent of Asia.

Our representatives made known our views on this subject not only here inside the country but also through various international forums that have relevance to the peace and stability of the Indo-Pakistan sub-continent and Asia generally.

We have drawn the attention of U.S. and other Western countries to the serious dangers that arise out of this policy, in CENTO, SEATO and in bilateral negotiations held at the highest level with the United States Administration.

Our fears are genuine. We are deeply concerned over this development. The decision to give long-term massive military assistance to India can only aggravate the tension prevailing in this region, and what is more important is that the decision to promise India long-term assistance may affect the settlement of the basic dispute dividing India and Pakistan.

The augmentation of military might of India tends to take the two countries farther apart and makes the settlement of outstanding dispute relating

to the State of Kashmir more difficult and more remote.

What makes this announcement all the more tragic is its timing. It has come at a time when Pakistan has taken a bold and courageous initiative to try an honourable and equitable settlement of the Kashmir dispute. I do not want here to repeat the importance of this recent development in the wake of the release of Shaikh Mohammad Abdullah from eleven years of imprisonment.

We were in the midst of vital negotiations. The late Prime Minister of India had at last realized the compelling need to settle the Kashmir dispute. Unfortunately Providence had its way and there had to be a break in the negotiations which had begun and were leading towards a tripartite discussion between the President of Pakistan, Prime Minister of India and Shaikh Mohammad Abdullah.

There has been a break in the salutary trend but it is our belief that the break was a temporary one only and of a short duration to permit the new Government of India to settle in. Therefore in the wake of these important developments the announcement of this decision is all the more regrettable.

Question: Don't you think this decision will jeopardize the security not only of Pakistan and the sub-continent but also of the entire region and those countries bordering on India?

Answer: I agree with the assumption you have made in the question. This question has already been partly answered and I need not go into details of all the consequences that flow from this decision because they are abundantly clear. I get what you have in mind. You seem to think about the delicate situation in South-East Asia linking this decision with that region.

I have made it clear that it is not a question of aggravation of tension between India and Pakistan but of the region as a whole. We as neighbours have lived together for centuries and will have to continue to live next to one another for all time to come. There is no doubt that we have fundamental differences, but they are not insurmountable. They can be overcome and they will be overcome provided we have the necessary wisdom and earnestness to remove all sources of misunderstanding that persist among us.

It is our firm belief, an article of faith with us, that we can resolve our outstanding disputes not in Napoleonic ways, the ways of ignoble past, but through purposeful negotiations which is the dictate of the present.

Question: It appears that USA wants to build India as a counterpoise to China in Asia. Do you think their purpose will be achieved?

Answer: This is not a matter which directly concerns us. We are not directly concerned with the global policies of the USA. With us the

considerations are our own security which is our duty towards the people of this country and the cause of peace in the sub-continent. We cannot subordinate our national interests to any other consideration.

Question: The United States Government has by this decision introduced arms race into Asia and particularly in this region. Don't you think this is unfortunate when the newly independent nations of Asia are engaged in economic development?

Answer: Indeed it impairs many of our hopes for the future. We are involved in the greatest of all battles and that battle is the eradication of poverty, misery and want. This is the only battle in the twentieth century worthy of a fight.

Arms race creates an arms psychosis. It affects not only the economic and physical imperatives, but what is more important, the mental and spiritual values of a people.

It is necessary for a country to arm itself for defence of its sovereignty and territorial integrity, to resist armed attack and aggression, but to inject arms race is an entirely different story. It is repugnant to all ideals for a better Pakistan and a happier and safer Asia and for a peaceful world.

Question: India has all along been obdurate and intransigent, and has refused to come to a settlement on Kashmir. Don't you think this latest American decision will make them still more intransigent receding still further the chances of Pakistan-India settlement?

Answer: I have already stated that this decision has profound significance. It affects many fundamentals not only within the region but also in the policies and approaches of those countries which have decided to provide India with long-term military assistance. It will have far reaching political implications.

It is a decision which may bring about a new interpretation of the concepts of alignment and non-alignment, a decision that can affect the power equilibrium in Asia and Africa and the world at large.

It is more in pain than anger that I express my views and make these observations. I do it with a sense of disillusionment. Our position in this respect has been and is unassailable. It is based on logic, realism and political morality.

It is a decision with which we will have to reckon with and make out adjustment. As I have already stated this decision is of far reaching consequences and of fundamental import, and affects us seriously.

However, we can reckon with it; and with our own resources, with the indomitable will and spirit of our people, we will find ways and means to overcome it for safeguarding our national interests.

Pakistan with its hundred million people occupying a pivotal position

in Asia, with a strong and stable regime enjoying the popular support of the people, with a President who has undoubtedly emerged as one of the leading personalities of our time, will continue to grow in strength and vitality.

So, I have no cause to despair. We have sufficient faith in our people and in their ability to face and over-come every situation, no matter how great the challenge.

Question: An American official has threatened Pakistan with reduction in aid. I hope you have seen that statement. I need not elaborate the threat.

Answer: I have read the report of the statement in our press. If there is any truth in the statement as it has appeared, all I have to say is, it is adding insult to injury. We are not easily subjected to threats. If that were the case we would have gone under long ago. It is against our national self-respect and history to bow down and surrender to threats.

Ever since Field Marshal Mohammad Ayub Khan has been responsible for the governance of Pakistan we have on all occasions done what is in the supreme interest of Pakistan. We have not allowed other considerations to supersede our national interest. We shall continue to pursue this policy vigorously nad energetically.

May I take this opportunity also to say that peoples and countries are not brought together by threats but common ideals and aspirations. If we are today closer to a particular people and a particular country it is because we share common ideals with them. For example, it is our religion which binds us to the Muslim world; it is our common aspirations as an Asian people which link us to Asians and Africans; it is our belief in freedom and liberty of the individual that binds us to the Commonwealth and the Western states; it is the spirit of good neighbourliness that causes us to have friendly and normal relations with our neighbours, Nepal, Afghanistan, Burma and China.

What I am trying to say is that aid is not the exclusive instrument and exponent of diplomacy for bringing people together. It can be an important and effective supplementary aspect of diplomacy but not its exclusive instrument. The paramount instrument of diplomacy is common understanding, common appreciation and common ideals. If aid is made the exclusive weapon of diplomacy it would mean complete subordination of morality to materialism.

Material gain is very important. Its importance cannot be under-rated. However, man does not live by bread alone. The world has been shaken by higher ideals even today. The world faces nuclear annihilation not because of material competition but because of clash between ideologies.

We are, however, grateful and aware of the assistance we have received. Time and again we have shown our appreciation in numerous ways. If a

balance sheet could be drawn of the material aid and the corresponding political and moral support rendered by Pakistan in return, the balance sheet would not embarrass Pakistan and its people.

Finally, what I have had to say on this important matter does not in any way mean that we are against India to get settled in and organized. Our objections are directed more towards the principles of this decision and less against the recipient of this aid.

The large-scale economic and military aid to India in effect already means a relative—I emphasise the word relative—reduction of U. S. aid to Pakistan. In other words, relatively speaking, the United States is already reducing aid to us by increasing manifold its aid to India. Now the question is if U.S. would consider it appropriate to do so in absolute terms. Will it want to commit the Aswan Dam blunder with regard to Pakistan? I think the U.S.A. knows it as well as we do that aid to Pakistan is as much in their interest as of Pakistan's material interest.

Moreover, Pakistan, like many other recipients of U.S. assistance, has not sought or received aid from the Soviet Union and other such sources. We have done this in order to be logical and to show our adherence to political principles, but logic and political principles are mutually interdependent.

The Soviet Union is an important neighbour of Pakistan. It has given extensive military and economic aid to the various countries of the world, and in our own region. Recently during Premier Khrushchev's visit to the United Arab Republic, in addition to the tremendous financial commitment towards the Aswan Dam, the U.S.S.R. has offered massive assistance to that country for executing the projects included in its Second Five-Year Plan of industrial development. On ad hoc basis the Soviet Union committed a hundred million pounds. Similarly Indonesia, a country with whom Pakistan has the closest fraternal relations, has been the recipient of colossal military and economic aid from the Soviet Union.

Therefore from all points of view the threat inherent in their stride is not due to any action of ours. We have done nothing to aggravate or strain relations between Pakistan and her allies.

If our allies are not sensible to Pakistan's basic sensitivities we cannot do more than express our concern and take the necessary steps to safeguard our national interests. There comes a time when the debate and dialogue must end. We have continued this debate for too long. It has not helped our cause or the cause of our allies.

In spite of our fears and protestations, in spite of our voice having been raised, they (U.S.) have gone their own way according to what they regard as their national global interests. As much as we have heard of threats we may also hear of sops and palliatives. But the issues are far too basic

to be overcome by either the remedy of threats or of palliatives. We know that the great powers with all their limitless resources can unleash various forces and indulge in diplomacy of punch and placation, but in the last analysis it is the sovereign will of people that prevails.

Question: Will this latest American decision to give long-term massive military aid to India further strain the relations between Pakistan and U.S.A.?

Answer: We do not want to precipitate a crisis. On the contrary we have taken all measures to avoid clash with our friends and allies. We are a peaceful people engaged in the full pursuit of our objective to give a better life to our people. Therefore, why should we want to create impediments? It is not in our interest at all.

But what are we to do? You only have to refer to the announcement of the U.S. long-term military assistance to India and note the formidable military assistance, to be able to appreciate and fathom our deep concern.

Interview with the Asia Magazine of Hong Kong on August 22, 1964

Question: With the gradual relaxation of tension between the super-states —the United States and the Soviet Union—the general pattern of cold war diplomacy seems to have undergone significant change. How has this change affected Asian countries, especially Asian diplomacy?

Answer: Recent developments in international politics, which particularly affect Asian countries are still rather difficult to define. There is little difference between politic and diplomacy as such; in diplomacy, as in politics, it is at times an impediment to define a situation in concrete terms. Of course, it is always possible to take a retrospective view of a phenomenon and analyse it in its historical perspective. But we are talking here of the present which is undergoing a process of constant change; the future always looks a little uncertain. In these circumstances, I can deal with your question only in rather general terms.

There are legacies which have been left behind by colonialism in our region. But even before colonialism appeared on the scene, there were many conflicts among Asian countries, sometimes within the countries themselves, which shaped and re-shaped their politics. There were ambitions fulfilled and ambitions unfulfilled. There were internal discords and tensions. This was happening almost everywhere. Take China for instance. This vast country has had her own share of internal troubles and differences between one region and another. The same was true of undivided India. Various interests clashed and, through centuries, the vast subcontinent faced one invasion after another from outside. The same kind of situation prevailed in many parts of Africa where the tribal form of society faced challenges unknown to Asians.

When imperialism appeared on the scene and gradually established its supremacy over countries in Asia and Africa, most of these conflicts were frozen. The conflicts which had once so directly influenced politics of these countries were reduced to the point of the lowest common denominator, to a battle between the ruler and the ruled. The colonies became part of empires and in a sense acquired their problems.

It is true that some of our local and regional conflicts were solved with the passage of time; but other basic ones remained. With the disappearance of colonialism, these basic conflicts are once again engaging our attention. The most important ones relate to boundary and territorial adjustments. I do not need to elaborate on them. There are many such problems all over Asia and Africa.

Question: How have these problems been affected by the cold war, by the tension between the East and the West?

Answer: As a result of the cold war and the creation of the United Nations, there have been many new alignments among nations reflecting the intensity of the political and diplomatic struggle. Some Asian and African countries which form part of these alignments were first led to believe that they could solve their basic disputes by taking up cold war positions, or even by exploiting cold war tensions in their favour. But by now many of them have found out that by linking their disputes to the cold war, they had only been aggravating their problems and, in effect, the cold war itself. With this realization has grown a new consciousness of African-Asian solidarity, as well as a consciousness of the importance of what I may call positive neutrality as against opportunist neutrality. The growth of Asian diplomacy, if one should use such a term, is essentially a product of this consciousness.

Question: Do you see any major change in this general situation as a result of the steady relaxation of tension between the Soviet Union and the West?

Answer: Yes, there is a change, a major change, as far as African and Asian countries are concerned. The creation of weapons of most devastating power has brought about a detente among the major cold war forces. This detente has undoubtedly reduced dangers of a general war; but the anger of local wars has increased, primarily because we have not so far resolved all our local and regional problems. This is where Afro-Asian diplomacy is being put to its real test. In other words, notwithstanding the loosening of cold war tension, we have to use all our efforts to stave off the danger of local wars. We cannot simply set aside disputes which exist among countries in Asia and Africa, especially problems of territorial and boundary adjustments. We have to find ways and means for resolving these disputes without resorting to methods which would destroy the

solidarity among our nations. This is a challenging situation.

Question: There are other fields in which Afro-Asian diplomacy seems to have become very active; for instance, in the United Nations. Now that you have attended U.N. sessions a number of times as Pakistan's chief representative, how would you assess the role of Asian diplomacy at the U.N.?

Answer: We must strengthen the United Nations and make it a truly effective weapon for establishing the rule of law all over the world. We must work hard to give the organization new strength and power to deal with problems that threaten local wars, which is our biggest problem today. We must, therefore, vigorously support U.N. efforts for general disarmament and strive to see that U.N. decisions and resolutions are fully honoured by U.N. members. We must realize that Afro-Asian unity and U.N. solidarity supplement one another. Similarly we must appreciate that Afro-Asian solidarity is not either opposed to or directed against Europe, North America. It is a positive force and, if given a chance, it can forge new links in the chain of unity across the world.

Since the growth of Afro-Asian solidarity is essentially a positive force working for peace, it must be given due recognition by the United Nations. It is high time the representation of Afro-Asian countries was more adequately reflected in U.N. organs, especially in the Security Council.

Question: While African and Asian countries work together within the United Nations, is it not desirable to set up a permanent machinery which could help countries in this region in solving their mutual problems?

Answer: Why not? I pay a tribute to African nations for having had the foresight and sense of continental solidarity to establish the machinery of the OAU to work for solutions of inter-African disputes. This is a major success for African diplomacy; but this has been achieved through stages, through a process of evolution. In Asia too, we have to work toward such a goal. But we must first lay the foundation for it. There are stages to be covered and we cannot always push the pace. For instance, there had to be a first Bandung Conference before we could start planning for a more frequent and broader meeting of African and Asian countries. The important thing is to move in the right direction, not necessarily to set up great land-marks. Once we have this sense of direction and a clear perspective of our goals, I am confident that Asian diplomacy can truly serve the cause of peace.

Speech at the Second Open Session of the Africasian Seminar on Art, Literature and Culture in Lahore on February 11, 1965

It is a pleasure for me to address this Seminar on Art, Literature and Culture, organized by the Pakistan Thinkers' Forum. I extend a hearty welcome to the distinguished representatives from other countries who have found it possible to come. I am sure their participation and their contribution to this seminar would not only ensure its success but also help to strengthen co-operation among the countries of Asia and Africa. It is my intention to speak on the content of Asian-African solidarity and to examine particularly the factors which impel two-thirds of mankind to seek unity amid diversity.

Among significant developments in the international sphere after the Second World War, the emergence of solidarity among the countries of Asia and Africa has certainly been a remarkable phenomenon. The Second Asian-African Conference of 1965, at which twice the number of countries that participated in the Bandung Conference of 1955 would be represented, would underline the conscious and deliberate will of the peoples of the two continents to find unity of purpose and action. While such meetings at the Head of State or Government level are necessarily occasional, the concept of Asian-African solidarity finds constant expression through the concerted action of the Asian-African bloc in the United Nations and in the growing number of organizations and meetings representing the various segments of the populations of the two continents. As the globe has shrunk through better communications, regional co-operation has become an accepted means of advancing the political, economic and cultural development of various parts of the world. However, the gowth of what may be called the Asian-African Movement is a truly striking development since the two continents do not conform to any known concept of regionalism.

What, one may naturally ask, is the basis of solidarity among the countries of Asia and Africa. The answer to this question is not simple. It also depends upon how one looks at this development. To the western observers to whom the evolution of Asian-African solidarity may be somewhat disquieting, the only feature these countries appear to have in common is their past and present experience of colonialism. In the countries of the Asian-African fraternity, there are those who envisage the emergence of an "Asian-African World" through ever-widening co-operation among them to make this group of countries an important factor in determining the course of world events. In seeking or analysing the real content of solidarity among the countries of Asia and Africa, I shall attempt to determine what it has been so far, what it could be, and perhaps also, what it should be.

The continents of Asia and Africa cover an area of about 28 million sq. miles which is 50% of the earth's land surface. The continent of Asia alone contains the greatest diversity of geographical features, including, as it does, the highest mountains, the deepest depressions, extensive plains, deserts and other features. With its varieties of landscape, climate, vagetation etc. Africa also defies any effort to treat it as a natural unit. Together, the two continents, although they are contiguous, can still less be regarded as a single or homogeneous region from the geographical point of view.

The two continents contain around two-thirds of the population of the world. The people of Asia and Africa encompass all the known races of man and profess all the major world religions most of which originated within the area. Their history does not have any semblance of unity. Indeed their social and cultural heritage is characterized by the same diversity as is found in their geographical configuration.

Considering this physical and human background of the two continents, and in the context of their recorded history, this urge towards solidarity among over two billion people must be viewed as a revolutionary concept.

I would like to submit that though the desire for solidarity among the Asian and African countries is rooted in their general experience of colonialism and imperialism with all the resultant indignities and exploitation, the fundamental characteristic of this community of purpose and thought is its moral content. To be subjected to the interests and ambitions of other powers violates human dignity and constitutes recognition of the supremacy of might over right. When nations emerging from foreign domination get together to safeguard their own independence and to promote the liberation of countries that are still subject to external control, it should not be regarded as merely a negative unity against colonialism but recognized as a positive force for maintaining human dignity and freedom. Needless to say, as long as vestiges of colonialism remain and peoples are subjected to discrimination or exploitation, the urge to oppose and remove such injustice would

also remain. But the concept guiding the aspirations of the peoples of Asia and Africa is positive and moral and has as its goals the consolidation of peace, the upholding of justice, the promotion of welfare and the flowering of culture.

I am conscious that this statement of the concept of solidarity in Asia and Africa may sound as too idealistic and ignoring the persistence of actual problems and disputes within the two continents that obviously stand in the way. I am all in favour of keeping one's feet on the ground and taking a realistic view. In a gathering of thinkers and intellectuals, however, one may well focus attention on values rather than on factual situations and take the long rather than the immediate view. With this background, I can attempt to analyse the content of Asian-African solidarity and to suggest how the ideals of this movement can best be applied to the concrete situation which currently exist in the two continents. I propose, naturally, to devote particular attention to the cultural aspect of Asian-African solidarity which potentially offers the greatest possibilities of fruitful co-operation.

The primary and initial motivation for Asian-African solidarity was political and its purpose was to promote the liberation of the countries of Asia and Africa from all the evils of colonial rule. This purpose has been largely achieved though there are still several countries, which remain under foreign domination, including, Angola, Mozambique, South West Africa and others. The free countries of Asia and Africa feel a natural obligation to help remove the remaining vestiges of colonialism and imperialism. They are also justifiably concerned with consolidating their independence and resisting neo-colonialism. Last but not least, the Asian-African countries have a fundamental stake in safe-guarding peace, promoting disarmament and creating general conditions under which they can devote their entire energies to their economic and cultural betterment. This explains their desire to strengthen the United Nations as an instrument of peace and co-operation.

At the preparatory meeting of the second Asian-African Conference there was general recognition that with the liberation of most countries in the two continents an accomplished fact, the time had come to devote more attention to solving the internal problems and disputes of Afro-Asian countries in an equitable and peaceful manner. President Soekarno, in his inaugural address, made special mention of such disputes and said, "Asian-African problems shall be solved by Asia-Africa itself in Asian-African way". This call was echoed by the delegate of Algeria. The delegate of Tanganyika taking up the theme of the settlement of international disputes within the Asian-African region emphasised that if Asia and Africa sought world peace, they must set an example to others. He called for a "machinery whereby we can discuss our points of difference". This suggestion was supported by the delegates of Iran and Nepal. There was another point of

view also which advocated that stress should be laid on points of agreement, rather than on disputes and differences. This view was stated eloquently by several delegates.

One would agree that divergencies among the Asian-African countries should not receive so much attention that their solidarity is affected. At the same time, since these countries profess certain principles and since the existence of certain disputes among them is a well-known fact, it is natural that those principles should find application in the settlement of their disputes. The provisional agenda agreed to by the preparatory meeting for the Second Asian-African Conference include items dealing with "The Peaceful Settlement of International Disputes", "Basic Principles for the Settlement of African-Asian Disputes", "Implementation of United Nations Resolutions by its Members", which will figure in its deliberations.

The Asian-African nations include large as well as small powers, and they have to evolve traditions of equal and just ralations among themselves so that local imperialisms do not emerge to replace Western colonialism. Just as the Organization of African Unity has set up machinery for settling African disputes, similarly there is needed a larger Asian-African organization for similar purposes, in order to supplement the work of the United Nations. The establishment of such an organization must be associated with a heightened awareness of the need to conform to principles of international law and justice.

Whether it is apartheid in South Africa, violation of the League of Nations mandate in South-West Africa, the independence of Pakistan, Mozambique, and Angola, or the right to self-determination of the people of Jammu and Kashmir, the solidarity of the Asian-African people cannot be forged or perfected except on the basis of the recognition of the birthright to freedom.

Apart from experience of Western colonialism, the other characteristic which most of the Asian-African countries have in common is their poverty. Their resources are generally either underdeveloped or geared to the economies of former colonial powers, and their standard of living is among the lowest in the world. Almost all of them have initiated ambitious plans for economic development through the mobilization of their own resources and by utilising financial and technical assistance from the more advanced countries. The liberation of Asia-Africa cannot be meaningful unless they also achieve economic independence. Consequently, while the value of friendly aid from the developed countries and international agencies is universally acknowledged, the ultimate aim of the Asian-African countries must be to build up their self-reliance and to be free from the restraints, direct and indirect, that arise from dependence upon other countries.

The general need for co-operation among the Asian and African countries is everywhere realized. The form and magnitude of such co-operation must

necessarily vary according to the conditions in different areas. During the United Nations Conference on Trade and Development, seventy-five countries, including most of the Asian-African countries and some countries of Latin America, evolved a common approach with a view to establishing a more favourable equation with the developed countries. This shows that the framework of economic consultation and co-operation can be expanded and the more developed countries in Asia and Africa can, in a spirit of mutual co-operation, extend their assistance to others which may be lagging behind.

I believe that economic co-operation among the Asian-African countries would assume ever-growing importance. The Second Asian-African Conference will give further thought to this key aspect of solidarity. Having attained political independence, the countries of Asia and Africa must co-ordinate their struggle against poverty, disease and illiteracy. A beginning has already been made towards fruitful co-operation through the AFRASEC meetings and there is vast scope for closer association among economists, planners and technicians who can learn a great deal from each other's experience.

I now come to the aspect of Asian-African solidarity which is of direct concern to this assembly. Just as there is a political problem which has been occupying the forefront of our consciousness, and an economic problem the dimensions of which are being realized, I believe there is also a cultural problem which we must begin to recognize.

The countries of Asia and Africa are heirs to ancient cultures. Most of them can look back to periods of great achievements in their history when they not only rose to power and influence but also made important contributions to the heritage of mankind. As already mentioned, all the world's great religions originated in these two continents and the impact of their cultural and intellectual traditions can be seen everywhere. Certain common characteristics, which are described as 'Oriental', have been attributed to the cultures of Asia and Africa. Notable among them are a preoccupation with spiritual and moral values and a genius for artistic expression.

Before the coming of Western colonialism, most of the countries of Asia and Africa had deep-rooted traditions of their own. The rise of national states and industrial power in European countries enabled them to make inroads into the two continents and to establish their hegemonies. Political and economic control naturally gave to the culture of the imperial powers a certain prestige and influence. A policy of deliberately imposing the culture and language of the colonial power was followed almost everywhere. The only way to participate in government or business under colonial regimes was by adopting the language of the ruling powers. With language goes the culture also. This process, therefore, resulted in the neglect and stagnation of indigenous languages and cultural institutions.

After independence, an important problem for the liberated countries of Asia and Africa is that of cultural synthesis. How should they revive and revitalise their native traditions and culture and to what extent should they retain the languages and customs which are the legacy of colonial rule? Some retention and continuation of western languages and institutions is indispensable to keep up with modern technology and research. Yet there are advocates of indigenous culture for whom the vestiges of western culture are totally repugnant. Various approaches have been made to this problem in different countries and valuable experience gained. We have no doubt that this seminar will be able to make a constructive contribution to finding a solution to the problem of the synthesis of the traditional and the modern way of life. I believe it is crucially important for the intellectuals and cultural leaders of the Asian-African countries to maintain and enlarge their contacts, not only to develop friendly relations but also to learn from each other.

The revolutionary consequences of political liberation are also visible in the art and culture of the countries of Asia and Africa and, I am sure, the poets, writers and artists of these countries can make a significant contribution to our solidarity by giving it a newer and deeper dimension. Our rich cultural heritage constitutes both a challenge and an inspiration to rise to new heights.

In the end, I congratulate the Pakistan Thinkers' Forum on organizing this seminar and am sure that it will further promote mutual understanding and friendship among the participating countries.

Account of the Presidential Address Given at the Founders' Day Academic Prize Distribution Ceremony of the Atchison College, Lahore on March 20, 1965

Pakistan has moved forward in determining the objectives of its foreign policy. It occupies a unique position between the East and the West, and has been brought about through the force of history.

Ours is an inseparable part of Asia and, therefore, we want to find Asian solutions of our problems. At the same time, we have vital stakes in the West. This does not mean that Pakistan seeks the role of an honest broker. We have always been honest but never brokers. We want to play a positive role as an Islamic state in Asia. We are in the process of establishing equilibrium internally.

As regards our relations with the Muslim World, since our destiny is linked with that of the Arabs, the time has come for Pakistan and U.A.R. to look anew at their relations. We have great admiration and respect for the people of U.A.R. and their President, General Gemal Abdul Nasser. We now want this relationship to be laid on sure foundations. Pakistan extends its hand of friendship to U.A.R. If there have been any differences in the past, between us, we want to remove them on the basis of equality, respect and dignity. Let the world know that we stand for the Arab World and its glory. We were against the creation of Israel and are still not prepared to recognize it. We are also against the supply of arms by West Germany to this unjustly created state, which would be more than derogatory for the cause of world peace.

As regards RCD, this Organization must be used for the promotion of the unity of Islamic states and the liquidation of imperialism. It stands for justice and equality, and Pakistan, as an Islamic state must ensure that. Pakistan must play its role in promoting friendly relations among

all the Muslim countries to bring about a glorious and harmonious Millat. Let us try internally and externally to make Pakistan a glorious state for which so many Muslims have given their lives.

In the State of Kashmir the people are once again facing a disastrous situation and are under repression which has created a big turmoil. It had often been said that let the United Nations decide the future of the state as to whether it should join India or Pakistan. This was a fine refinement and the people of Kashmir have been living with it for the last seventeen years. The fact is that Kashmir is a part and parcel of Pakistan. If there is any doubt about this then let there be a plebiscite, and the world would come to know about the truth.

It has also been said that the lives of fifty million Muslims of India would be in jeopardy if a plebiscite is held in Kashmir. This is no argument and represents a 'hostage theory' which has shocked the civilized world. It is a pity indeed if India with its twenty-six Divisions and outstanding paraphernalia of Law and Order were not in a position to protect its minorities. This is a shocking admission and could not be heard of even in a country like Congo. If India was afraid of the communal trouble then let the state of Kashmir be transferred to Pakistan without a plebiscite as it belongs to Pakistan as much as any other part of Pakistan *e.g.* Sukkar, Mianwali, Karachi etc. This would facilitate India's problem. So let it become automatically a part of Pakistan.

We look upon the coming Afro-Asian Conference as a great occasion. We welcome the Afro-Asain countries to the Conference where questions of international morality would be determined. Pakistan has nothing to hide and suffers from no immorality. Of course, there are certain countries which look askance on the Conference. We know why they fear and why there is gloom and secrecy. Yet the Conference would be a glorious success. Although the Afro-Asian countries are individually poor, yet together they are a great phenomenon and a great factor. This solidarity had given rise to the French Revolution and had brought Lenin back to the Soviet Union. Pakistan is now in the vanguard of the Afro-Asian movement for achieving it in order to bring about an international revolutions against foreign domination, injustice, exploitation, imperialism, colonialism, neocolonialism and oppression.

The greatest exacting task of all the under-developed nations is to give better life to their peoples. It cannot be measured in terms of investments and projects like PICIC and IDBP, but in the context of the dedicated political objectives within the frame-work of certain moral values.

Pakistan has been created as an ideological state within certain agreed principles and norms of morality and social justice. In the past we had been going without a sense of direction and purpose and that did not help.

For us, to make progress, was through clearly defined moral values. If we did not do that, we would find ourselves in a state of animated suspension, callousness and confusion, devoid of social respect. We are a nation of hundred million and our economic progress within the limitations of our political ideals must pass this test. This nation has already been mobilised and that test already passed. This required a sense of direction which has already been acquired. This regime and its leader have achieved much for the country as compared to the situation obtaining in 1958. It has internally and externally found soultions of intricate national problems. Although the first and the last line of the chapter has been written by him, his great task of achieving those goals is yet to begin. The next five years are very crucial for the people of Pakistan and its Government. The year 1970 is bound to come just like 1965. We are not at the end of millennium. Time would go ruthlessly and inexorably. Solutions will have to be found. It is the collective enterprize and participation of the people that is required. Therein lies the essence of Pakistan's progress and an answer to India's difficulties. India is facing these difficulties because it has not been able to establish a sense of equilibrium, understanding and the spirit of give and take. That is why she is not getting on well with the world. It has failed to adjust itself within its own society. We may look at the American society, their sense of achievement. It could apply to any nation.

Once the people have decided on a readjustment of their problems, they should represent the collective will of the nation. They have to understand the world as a whole. There was a time when Pakistan looked at the world through the challenge and image of India and regarded that country a great menace. But now the stage has been reached when they first look at the world and then on India. They do not see India as a separate identity but as part of the world and then judge it. This is a great achievement and contribution of Pakistan. The world is changing, the values are changing, ideas and concepts are changing, and this must be reflected as a mirror reflects the beauty of the face. We are living in an age in which the people are going in outer space. We must change according to the changing realities. The youth of this country have to play a vital role in this evolution of modern age.

Speech at the Tenth Anniversary of the First African-Asain Conference in Djakarta on April 19, 1965

Today we commemorate with appropriate solemnity the tenth anniversary of the First African-Asian Conference. The significance of that event was described by you, Mr. President, as the "first inter-continental conference of the so-called coloured peoples in the history of mankind".

It is indeed befitting that these celebrations should take place under your personal auspices as you have been an originator of the movement for African-Asian solidarity. Permit me to thank you, Mr. President, for providing us with inspiration and for being the moving spirit behind these celebrations. I would also like to express our gratitude to the Government and the people of Indonesia, particularly the citizens of Djakarta, for the warm welcome and gracious hospitality which they have extended to us. In doing so I have no doubt that I am voicing the sentiments of every delegation present here.

I consider it my duty and privilege to convey to this august gathering the greetings and good wishes from my President, Field Marshal Mohammad Ayub Khan, and from the Government and people of Pakistan. The President greatly regrets his inability to be here today particularly as he believes that these celebrations would further contribute to the strengthening of African-Asian solidarity and co-operation in the interest of peace and justice in our time. It is his desire that I should express to you his best wishes for the success of these celebrations. In a short span of twenty years which is but a moment in the life of nations the African-Asian Revolution has changed the course of history and placed us, the peoples of Asia and Africa, in the vanguard of the war for human liberation.

It has become our historic mission to put an end to imperialism and

colonialism in every part of world. It is our inescapable duty to God and to man to eliminate systems of domination and exploitation which have brought untold sorrows to mankind. The fulfilment of this mission demands that we wage a ceaseless and resolute struggle against all forms of injustice which have caused such tragic conflicts in human history. The African-Asian movement seeks not only to regain for its members their inalienable rights and dignities but also to establish values and forms of lasting benefit to the progress of mankind. It remains our sacred task to establish a new international order based on law and justice in which all races of mankind may truly become free and equal.

Notwithstanding the crushing burdens imposed on our countries by foreign domination and exploitation, we face and shall continue to face the future with confidence. It is the justice of our resolve which inspires us to greater effort than our individual circumstances would otherwise permit. If we are to succeed, and succeed we must, it would be imperative for us to sink our differences and resolve our disputes by faithfully adhering to the ten principles of the Bandung Declaration.

The question may be asked: Are we equal to this challenge? Individually most of us are poor, weak and have but begun to struggle against the burden of centuries. We are rent by our disputes. Large parts of our continents are still shackled by imperialism and colonialism. In others, self-determination and human rights are denied. Nations remain divided and ravaged by scourage of war. Arms race has spread to our regoin, menacing our security. We face the direct peril to our very survival by ultimate weapons that have been forged and which as yet lie beyond our control. All these burdens and dangers confront peoples of Africa and Asia. In this continent armed conflicts pose the greatest threat to international peace. If mankind is to be saved from an even greater tragedy a beginning must be made by seeking a durable settlement in Asia on the basis of respect for international agreements and the right to self-determination of people. An enlargement of the conflict would be an immeasurable tragedy for all mankind. This is basic to the concept of the Bandung Declaration which admits of no compromise.

There is no reason to despair. We have awakened to a new life which is pulsating, vibrant and indestructible. Our nations have had a new birth. We number two thirds of human race. Collectively we, the peoples of Asia and Africa, can and must become an irresistible force, mightier than all the problems and perils which confront us.

Let us therefore end our differences and settle our disputes. Let us resolve never to submit, yield or be overcome. Let us unite our strength and forge solidarity against which nothing shall prevail. The task begun ten years ago here in Indonesia must be carried on.

The people and nations of Asia and Africa are the heirs to most of the great civilizations that the world has ever seen. The ideas of freedom, equality, dignity and fraternity of people are spiritual legacy of our great prophets, law givers and teachers. It is to them that we must turn for inspiration as we bend our collective efforts to reshape political and economic relations in pursuit of peace and justice.

As we prepare ourselves for the second world congress of African and Asian peoples, let us invoke the spirit of Bandung which could unite us for the emancipation and progress of mankind.

Message to the Karachi Union of Journalists on Afro-Asian Journalists Day on April 24, 1965

It gives me great pleasure to commend the valuable work that the Karachi Union of Journalists has undertaken in connection with the celebration of the Afro-Asian Journalists Day.

The Afro-Asian personality has already acquired great significance, and the identity of spirit and the common aspirations of our peoples have been universally recognized. Journalists have a particularly responsible role to play in popularizing the theme and objectives of the movement for African-Asian solidarity.

In the years to come the need for greater understanding and closer co-operation will be still greater, and on the ability of the present generation of African-Asian citizens to give a good account of themselves will depend not only the fate of our contemporary world civilization, but also the future course of human history.

I join all of you in wishing your celebrations every success.

Speech at the SEATO Ministerial Conference in London on May 3, 1965

On behalf of the Government of Pakistan and on my own behalf I wish to express my grateful thanks to our hosts, the British Government, for their hospitality and for the excellent arrangements they have made for this conference.

I also wish to express our appreciation to Prime Minister Harold Wilson for his inaugural address to which we have listened with the greatest interest.

Important international developments have taken place since the Council met a year ago in Manila. The Council will no doubt provide an opportunity for its members for a free and frank exchange of views on these developments. It is the sincere hope of my delegation that these exchanges will contribute objectively and constructively towards the lessening of tension in the area, the removal of fear and threat of expansion of war from the minds of people, and securing and maintaining of peace and tranquillity in the region.

Indeed we look upon SEATO which is a defensive pact as an instrument for preservation and strengthening of peace and socio-economic stability in our region, and for promoting the aims and purposes of the United Nations.

For Pakistan which is determined to provide a higher standard of living for its people, it is essential that she should be able to devote undisturbed and in peace all her energies and resources towards the elimination of poverty, misery and want. It has therefore been our constant endeavour to work for the promotion of peace in the region and to uphold the principles of the U.N. Charter. It is with these objectives in view that the

Government of Pakistan are pursuing programmes of intensive national development at home, and a policy of normalization and development of friendly relations with all neighbouring countries.

In fact the Pakistan Constitution states that international peace and security should be promoted, goodwill and friendly relations among all nations should be fostered, and the settlement of international disputes by peaceful means should be encouraged. It is our objective to put into practice the declarations contained in our Constitution and implicit in the purpose that gave birth to our state.

I am happy to note that under the aegis of SEATO some economic projects have been established in the regional countries, which will help promote economic progress and technical co-operation among the regional members.

The economic well being and improved standards of living of the peoples in the area are fundamental to the building of a sound base for stability and progress in the region.

The realization of these projects will lessen the burden of centuries imposed on the peoples of this part of Asia. It is necessary that the economic activities of SEATO should expand. In this context we welcome the proposal of the SEATO Secretary General for increased economic activities of SEATO and technical co-operation among regional countries, and hope that his proposal will receive favourable consideration. We are grateful for the generous assistance and support of the non-regional members for the economic activities of SEATO, and hope that they will continue and increase their financial and technical support in this direction.

Before I conclude I wish to extend our appreciation to the Secretary General and his staff for the hard work they have put in during the past year, and for making excellent Secretariat arrangements for this Council meeting. Once again may I thank Her Britannic Majesty's Government for providing facilities for holding this meeting in London and for extending to us their warm hospitality.

Interview in the British Broadcasting Corporation's Programme 'Tonight' in London on May 6, 1965

Question: Mr. Bhutto, some observers have said that over the past eighteen years Pakistan's foreign policy has been based on the fear of India. Now, how much of this fear has disappeared?

Answer: Not entirely incorrect. In the beginning when partition took place, many lives were lost and millions of people had to sacrifice a great deal for the creation of Pakistan; and we got involved into difficult and almost intractable problems with India, the most important of which was about the future of the State of Kashmir. So in the past the fear of India was very much in the minds of Pakistani leaders and Pakistani people, but gradually over the years there has been some settling down of that situation; and today I would not say that Pakistan's foreign policy was orientated exclusively on the basis of India's foreign policy.

Question: You said today in a public speech that you deprecated the element of chauvinism and the claim of victory in some Pakistani newspapers, but has'nt your foreign policy towards India done too little to stop this attitude?

Answer: No, I don't think so. On the contrary it has been India's foreign policy which has been directed against Pakistan, and we have had to react to it. It is not that we have taken the initiative in pursuing a policy of the present nature towards India. On the contrary we have always advocated negotiations, settlement of all our disputes by peaceful means. Even in the present conflict, as I have said this afternoon, we don't want to talk in terms of a military victory of one side over the other, and would much rather talk in terms of settling our disputes, leaving the tanks and the trenches, and coming down to the negotiating table.

Question: When you have got to the negotiating table, how much give and how much take would there be?

Answer: We would be prepared to negotiate unless you enter with such conditions. After all, there is no purpose to negotiations if one party wants to have its way exclusively and entirely.

Question: Now, Pakistan and France would appear to play down the whole Chinese threat in South-East Asia. Now, are you not in the least concerned for the security of Vietnam and Malaysia?

Answer: Actually we are concerned over these matters. We are deeply concerned. Malaysia and Vietnam are neighbours of Pakistan, and are geographically close to us, and we are therefore, very much concerned; but as we have said repeatedly it is only a question of a different attitude to a common objective. We feel that basically these are political problems and one must find political solutions to these issues.

Question: What is then your attitude to Mr. Wilson's East-of-Suez Policy? Does it conflict with your policy?

Answer: This afternoon again I had to make reference to what we have heard being described as a Policy of East-of-Suez. If there is to be a Policy of East-of-Suez, one has to see what is the Policy of West-of-Suez? Because it would imply that there is a difference. The policy of West-of-Suez is a policy of accommodation, co-operation and friendship with all countries. We hope and pray that the Policy of East-of-Suez is also of a similar nature; and if that be the philosophy of the Policy of East-of-Suez then we welcome it, and we hope that it would be of a lasting duration. But if that is not so, I am afraid that policy cannot be of a lasting duration.

Question: How far your own policy of close friendship with China is designed to take advantage of India's conflict with China?

Answer: I would have certainly said that it was entirely incorrect. Our policy of friendship and normalization of relations with China is an objective one and based on positive considerations. It does not emanate from any fear of India. China is an important neighbour of Pakistan. There are seven hundred million people in China. It is a member of the family of Afro-Asian states. We believe in Afro-Asian solidarity. We also believe that the United Nations must be strengthened, and that cannot be done unless China participates in the deliberations of the United Nations as a great power. Even we believe that disarmament cannot be meaningful and effective without China's participation in the United Nations. The issues of South-East Asia cannot be resolved without China's participation. That is only a recognition of an important reality, and there is nothing sinister or invidious about our relations with China.

Speech on Pakistan and the Muslim World at the Pakistan Islamic Council for International Affairs, Karachi on June 13, 1965

An essential feature of the foreign policy of Pakistan is its marked emphasis on relations with the world of Islam as a factor in the emancipation and progress of mankind. The nature of this emphasis has passed through its own variations. The intensity of belief and pre-occupation with its objectives have, however, not been impaired by the passage of time.

At the centre of the Islamic world, stability and security had given rise to an attitude of the mind akin to unconcern. On the contrary, its frontier regions, which had to struggle against hostile forces, never ceased to manifest a deep loyalty to the concept of Islamic unity.

Even though the Caliphate had, since the middle of the tenth century A.D., lost all effective power, it is remarkable that there remained a solitary corner of the Islamic world which still looked towards the centre. To preserve the unity of the 'ummat', mighty rulers like Mahmud of Ghazni, Iltutmish and Balban sought, with the utmost humility, the benediction of the Caliph over their rule in the kingdoms which they had carved out for themselves.

Although the Mughals, who established their empire in 1526, refused to acknowledge the Turkish Sultan as Caliph, that did not prevent them from taking an active interest in Islamic and pan-Islamic affairs.

With the decline of Mughal power in the eighteenth century, began the era of British ascendency over India. Politically independent Muslim states on the peripheries of the Islamic world, fell one by one before the on slaught of the Western powers. The Empire of the Mughals was finally liquidated in 1857. By 1886, Russia had conquered the Caucasus and extended its possessions to the frontiers of Iran and Afghanistan, who were themselves

the victims of the Anglo-Russian scramble for empires. Malaya, long subject to European intrigues and infiltration, came under British occupation towards the close of the century. About the same time, the Indonesian archipelago, a chronic threatre of strife between European powers, succumbed to Dutch colonialism. In the Western confines of the Islamic world, Algeria, Tunisia, Egypt, the Sudan and other territories in Africa fell one by one to European colonial powers. By the close of the century, the despoliation of the outlying Muslim countries and peoples was almost complete.

In the sub-continent, after the abortive War of Independence of 1857, the British adopted measures that struck at the very root of the economic and cultural life of the defeated Muslims. Earlier they had openly taken steps to liquidate Muslim educational trusts, keep the Muslims out of legal and other professions and exclude them from higher civil and military services.

In this crucible of experience of the rigours and humiliation of alien rule, the Muslims of India learnt to rise above their internal schisms and to form a solidarity based on the spirit of the all-inclusive brotherhood of Islam which they looked upon as the sole hope and means of their redemption from colonial bondage.

The Muslim intelligentsia argued that in Islam, political conduct and religion—*siyasat and din*—could not be separated and, therefore, Muslims could not attain self-expression save in an Islamic polity. Historically, separate, and even national, states had always existed within the domains of Islam, but they had always recognized the indivisibility of the *Ummat*.

Sultan Abdul Hamid of Turkey strove to gather all Muslims in the spiritual fold of the Caliphate. His emissaries went forth to places as far afield as China, Java and Algeria to win the allegiance of Muslims. The whole Islamic world reverberated with the cry of pan-Islamism. But no Muslim people felt so stirred by its appeal as did the Muslims of the sub-continent. They rallied to the Ottoman cause and made it their own. They denounced their British rulers for policies and actions aimed at undermining and encroaching on the Ottoman Empire. Pan-Islamic fervour swelled up as never before and the Sultan's name was included in the Friday *Khutba*.

In the first decade of the present century, attacks on Iran by Russia, on Tripoli by Italy and on Turkey by the Balkan allies roused the Muslim community as it had never been roused before. Mass meetings were held all over the sub-continent. The Council of All-India Muslim League denounced Italian aggression; Italian goods were boycotted. Muslim leadership, comprising of Maulana Shibli, Allama Muhammad Iqbal, Maulana Mohamed Ali and Maulana Zafar Ali Khan, stirred the Muslims with their

poetry, speeches and writings. Students of the Aligarh college opened a relief fund for the sufferers. Large contributions were made to the Red Crescent Fund and a medical mission was sent to tend to the Turks wounded in the Balkan Wars.

In 1914, when Turkey entered the First World War on the side of the Central Powers (Germany and the Austro Hungarian Empire), concern for her fate became widespread. Its pulse-beat was faithfully articulated in an historic article by Maulana Mohamed Ali in the "Comrade", in reply to a highly provocative editorial by the London "Times", threatening the Ottoman Empire with destruction unless the Sultan bowed to the wishes of Britain and her allies. Reminding the British of the acts of treachery committed by them against the Turks, and of the solemn promises made to Egypt, and shamelessly broken, Maulana Mohamed Ali asked whether it was not both moral and expedient for the Tuks to take by force what had been denied to them by right. Offering a word of advice to the British Government, he said:

> "England must officially repudiate the threats recklessly flung by the "Times" at the Turks, and in fact at the entire Muslim world. England must go to the land of Sphinx and solve the new riddle of this war in the only way it can be solved. It must leave Egypt. Need we say this will win over to her side the Mussalmans of the world better than all the threats of the tactful "Times".

This forthright article led to the imprisonment of Maulana Mohamed Ali as well as his brother, Maulana Shaukat Ali. The two brothers were released after the end of the War in December, 1919. The Muslims of the sub-continent then organized the Khilafat Movement. The Ali Brothers became its acknowledged leaders and Maulana Mohamed Ali was selected to lead a deputation to Europe to acquaint the victors of the First World War, more especially the British, with the point of view of the Muslims of the sub-continent, which in essence was that Muslim territories be left intact, and that the Caliph's authority should remain uncurtailed. The Muslim community felt that weak as the Ottoman Empire had grown, it still represented the unity of Islam.

The harsh conditions, which the Treaty of Sevres (1920) sought to impose upon the Turks, further inflamed the sentiments of the Muslims. All the pent-up feelings now found an outlet in a movement which did more to shake the foundations of the British Empire in India than any preceding one. Since the rebellion of 1857, the force and the momentum behind the Khilafat Movement and the determination of the Muslims to keep it going, regardless of sacrifices, provided a pattern for the Pakistan movement which was to come two decades later. However, after defeating the invading Greeks and challenging the occupation forces of the allies in 1922, Mustafa

Kamal Ataturk and his comrades first equated the Caliphate with 'spiritual' as opposed to 'temporal' power and then finally abolished the institution altogether. They felt that the Muslim countries were not unanimously behind it; nor could they be, while so many of them were subject to foreign rule.

While Turkey was in the grip of a radical upsurge under the leadership of Kamal Ataturk, the Muslims of the sub-continent had already embarked on a painful process of self-analysis and introspection to restate and redefine their political philosophy and aims. The lingering feeling of pride in their past achievements was given coherent expression by their leaders of thought.

Among the first to reinterpret Islamic doctrine, had been Sir Syed Ahmad Khan (1812—98). His thesis was that Islam and modern thought, in the ultimate analysis, were not mutually exclusive. He founded at Aligarh, in 1876, a college in which religious education was combined with the study of modern arts and sciences.

Among the several writers who sought to restate Islamic thought and ethics, was Syed Ameer Ali, a distinguished jurist. His book the "Spirit of Islam", published in 1981, furnished the awakening political consciousness of Muslims with a reasoned basis for self-esteem, which they needed in their confrontation with the Western world. The most eminent service rendered by Syed Ameer Ali to the cause of Islam was the statement of Islamic doctrine in Western terms and the interpretation of the teachings of Islam in the light of contemporary social ideals.

The argument that in taking over modern Western learning and science, Muslims were only reverting to an old tradition of their civilization was persuasively stated by Allama Muhammad Iqbal (1876-1938). His activist philosophy exerted a powerful influence on the younger generation of Muslims and contributed to the emergence in 1947 of Pakistan. In fact, the ideas of Iqbal have exerted a great deal of influence on modern Islam, recapturing its vitality and redefining its content.

In the contemporary period there was thus a new movement for the stimulation of the Islamic spirit, at the same time significant steps were taken to come to terms with the social, political and scientific requirements of the present day world. It was in this period that the demand for Pakistan was conceived to provide the Muslims of the sub-continent with a homeland of their own in which they could live according to their own way of life. Representing as it did the fulfilment of an aspiration, ideological as well as political, of a hundred million Muslims, Pakistan came to manifest a deep interest in and real concern for the welfare of Muslims the world over in their struggle for freedom and emancipation.

It was as early as the time of the Khilafat movement that the Muslims of

the sub-continent became apprehensive about Zionist ambitions in regard to the Holy Land. Meetings and demonstrations were held to denounce Zionist intrigues and the British policy of turning Palestine, an Arab territory and a land holy to Muslims, into a home for Jews. The support unstintedly extended by Indian Muslims to the cause of the Palestine Arabs was not entirely without effect on the British Government.

When, after Hitler's rise to power in Germany, the flow of Jewish immigrants into Palestine became a flood, an Arab rebellion broke out in Palestine. The Muslim League, under the leadership of the Quaid-i-Azam, denounced expropriation of the indigenous population of Palestine by alien immigrants and called upon the British Government to stop further Jewish immigration and to allow the Arabs to exercise full political rights. The British Government appointed a Royal Commission to recommend a solution for the Palestine problem. The recommendations of the Royal Commission were shelved because of the out-break of the Second World War. When, in August 1947, Pakistan emerged as an independent state the Palestine situation was nearing the explosion point. Organized illegal immigration had swelled the Jewish population of Palestine to one third of the total. The Jewish settlers, heavily armed with modern weapons, were ready for war. Powerful political pressure was being exercised by the Zionists in the United States and other Western countries to open Palestine to unlimited Jewish immigration and for the immediate establishment in it of a sovereign Jewish state.

Palestine thus became the first problem in international affairs to engage the attention of the newly independent State of Pakistan. The Balfour Declaration and the Mandate of the League of Nations over Palestine, were in violation of British pledges of independence to the Arabs, and the proposal in the United Nations to create in it a state for aliens, in the teeth of indigenous opposition, was contrary to International Law and the Charter of the United Nations. This was the position taken by Pakistan. One of the first acts of the Head of the new State was to address a forceful letter to President Truman to desist from the "monstrous" attempt to deprive the Arabs of Palestine of their country, which had been their homeland for two thousand years.

When the Palestine question came up before the General Assembly Sir Zafrullah Khan declared that the Pakistan delegation was utterly and uncompromisingly opposed to the creation of a Jewish state in Palestine. Arguing that the proposed scheme of partition was unfair and impractical and, if implemented, would lead to strife, Sir Zafrullah Khan urged that the juridical issues involved in it should be referred to the International Court of Justice. Pakistan, he said, deeply sympathized with the Jews but the proper solution of the problem would be that Jewish refugees should

be reintegrated in the countries to which they belonged. Should this not be possible, Sir Zafrullah pleaded, they should be offered facilities for settlement in the newer and larger countries, which had more space and greater resources than tiny Palestine.

The supporters of the partition scheme, however, were determined to carry it through at all cost. The great powers resorted to tactics of naked coercion and duress to compel the smaller member states to vote for it. Thus the necessary two-thirds majority was obtained and a resolution adopted by the General Assembly, recommending the partition of Palestine and the establishment in it of a Jewish state. This was in November 1947.

Pakistan has remained unswervingly and resolutely unreconciled to Israel, which was proclaimed as a "State" in May, 1948. It has refused to recognize Israel or to have any thing to do with it. Pakistan has continued to take an active interest in all subsequent developments in regard to Palestine and to sponsor resolutions about it on behalf of the Arabs year after year. Invariably, Pakistan has been in the forefront of those defending the principles of justice and International Law so cynically violated by the majority of the United Nations in planting a state for alien Jews in the heart of the Arab world.

Recently when the veil of secrecy which had shrouded the German-Israel Agreement of 1960 for the supply of war material to Israel was removed, the strong resentment of the Arab countries, whose security had thereby been jeopardized, was fully appreciated in Pakistan. Despite its friendship with West Germany, Pakistan's sympathy was with the Arabs.

Pakistan's stand on the Palestine question is a typical example of its dedication to the struggle against colonialism and imperialist domination. The consistency with which Pakistan continues to voice its opposition to alien occupation of the homeland of the Palestinian Arabs exemplifies its adherence to the spirit of Islam which enjoins perpetual struggle against unequity and injustice. There are other important characteristics of Islam whose relevance to our contemporary times has been confirmed by no less a person than Arnold Toynbee, and I quote from his book "Civilization on Trial":

> "The forces of racial toleration, which at present seem to be fighting a losing battle in a spiritual struggle of immense importance to mankind, might still regain the upper hand if any strong influence militating against race consciousness that has hitherto been held in reserve were now to be thrown into the scales. It is conceivable that the spirit of Islam might be the timely reinforcement which would decide this issue in favour of tolerance and peace."

It is not only the doctrine of Islam and its historic association with the struggle of mankind against tyranny and oppression that inspire the

leadership of Islamic countries today to identify itself with the struggle against foreign domination. It must be remembered that Islam itself has had the worst experience of imperialist alien domination. Ever since the Middle Ages, starting with the Crusades, the lands of Islam have faced successive invasions from the citadels of imperialism and colonialism. From Morocco to Indonesia, the heart and soul of Islam have suffered from the domination of every colonial power of Europe. The British, the French, the Germans, the Dutch and the Portuguese, have all held down one or another.

In the case of Islam, its experience of colonialism in all its manifestations has been an enduring phenomenon with all its attendant humiliations, indignities and sufferings. It was a case of a live and dynamic civilization stifled by oppression and systematically dismembered limb from limb. Its anguish was not even redeemed by any opiate of unconsciousness. Compared to the endless humiliation, subjugation and exploitation suffered by the world of Islam, even the awareness of a Washington or a Lenin of the inequities and dangers of imperialism and colonialism appear somewhat academic.

Islam as a force was conceived in the struggle for equality and justice. It is only in the fitness of things that having suffered extensively under imperialism and colonialism, it could now in this era of freedom demonstrate, an even greater degree of dedication to the cause of human liberty, justice and equality. The opposition to imperialism and colonialism of other forces is at best founded on an apprehension and a doctrinaire conviction, but in Islam, it is a part of the religion itself. Thus Islam is committed morally and historically to lead the struggle against domination and exploitation.

Reference has been made to Pakistan's endeavours in the cause of Palestine. But there are other instances too in which Pakistan has given unflinching support to Muslim peoples struggling to regain their independence and their dignity as free nations.

The question of the future of former Italian colonies of Libya, Italian Somaliland and Eritrea was considered by the General Assembly of the United Nations during its Third Session, in 1949. The First Committee of the General Assembly recommended a solution identical with that previously agreed upon between the three occupying powers, Britain, France and Italy, in the Bevin-Sforza Agreement. This solution envisaged a united independent Libya after ten years; in the interim period, the territory was to be divided between the three powers and held in trusteeship by them.

Pakistan vigorously espoused the cause of the people of these former colonies. Our Foreign Minister, Sir Zafrullah Khan, vehemently opposed the trusteeship plan of the former colonial powers and urged that independence be given to a united Libya. If it was considered that immediate

independence was not feasible, argued Sir Zafrullah Khan, Libya should be placed under the direct administration of the Trusteeship Council and prepared for independence in the shortest possible time. This stand of Pakistan in opposition to the Western powers was vindicated when the General Assembly decided in November, 1949, that a united Libya should become independent by January, 1952. The General Assembly appointed a U.N. Commission to assist in the transition of Libya to independence. Pakistan was elected a member of this Commission and played an active part in bringing the country into the family of free nation. Libya was admitted to membership of the United Nations on December 14, 1955.

As regards Italian Somaliland, Pakistan put forward a radical solution, suggesting the amalgamation of all Somali areas, namely those formerly under Italian or British rule and those still under French rule, to form an independent Greater Somalia. The stand taken by Pakistan resulted in the supersession of the original Western proposal. The General Assembly decided that Somaliland, consisting of the former British and Italian colonies in it, be placed under U.N. Trusteeship for a period of ten years, after which it was to become independent. Somalia was admitted to the United Nations on September 20, 1960.

The freedom movements of the three countries of the *Maghreb* evoked a deep sense of sympathy in Pakistan. *Maghreb* leaders, Habib Bourguiba, Allal-Fassi, Mohemmed Yazid and others visited Pakistan and were enthusiastically received. For its part, the Government of Pakistan gave all possible support to the people of North Africa in their struggle for the restoration of their sovereignty and independence. On all the three questions, Tunisia, Morocco and Algeria, Pakistan played a leading role in the United Nations and was frequently chosen by the Asian-African nations as their spokesman.

Pakistan was a member of the Security Council and its representative, Ahmed Shah Bokhari, was its President for the month, when the Tunisian Government, in April, 1953, asked for the consideration of the grave situation that had arisen as a result of French policy of suppression. While the Tunisian question was placed on the provisional agenda of the Council, its formal adoption was strongly opposed by France on the ground that Tunisia was a French protectorate and as such Franco-Tunisian relations were a matter essentially within the domestic jurisdiction of France and outside the competence of the United Nations by virtue of Article 2, paragraph (7) of its Charter. Speaking on that occasion, Prof. Bokhari said:

> "Today, 10 April, 1953, will go down in the history of the United Nations as the day on which the foundations were laid for the suppression of free discussion in the United Nations. This would be the first

instance in the history of the United Nations in which the mere adoption of an agenda item was opposed so stoutly in the Council, and to death. This will also go down in the history of the United Nations as the day of very great and lamentable reversals of policy."

Frustrated in the Security Council, the Asian-African nations, in 1953, brought the matter before the General Assembly. A resolution introduced by Pakistan called for the restoration of civil liberties in Tunisia and for negotiations with a view to enabling the Tunisian people to exercise their right of self-determination. The resolution was supported by most of the African-Asian states, but inspite of it, a combination of powerful forces, opposed to the resolution, prevented its adoption.

Pakistan continued to strive for the restoration of the sovereign rights of the Tunisian people until this goal was achieved in 1956.

The question of Morocco was analogous to that of Tunisia. The Sultan of Morocco had been coerced to sign the Treaty of Fez of 1912 ceding to France, the sovereign right of conducting the foreign relations of Morocco. Invoking provisions of this Treaty, France maintained that under Article 2(7) of the Charter, relating to domestic jurisdiction, the United Nations was debarred from considering the matter. The question had been inscribed on the agenda of the General Assembly, in 1952, at the instance of African-Asian States, Pakistan being one of them.

In 1953, the African-Asian States requested the President of the Security Council to call an urgent meeting of it to consider the situation arising out of the deposition of Sultan Mohammad V and his imprisonment by the French Government. Despite every effort by Pakistan and Lebanon, which were at that time members of the Council, the item was not inscribed on the Council's agenda. In the General Assembly, later that year, Sir Zafrullah Khan pleaded the cause of Morocco and denounced the imposition by imperialist powers on smaller and weaker States of unequal treaties such as the Treaty of Fez. Thirteen African-Asian nations sponsored a draft resolution recommending that martial law be terminated and civil liberties restored in Morocco and that steps be taken to assure the independence of Morocco within five years. This proposal could not secure the necessary majority.

Again in 1954, Pakistan was one of the fourteen African-Asian states which requested the inclusion of the Moroccan question in the agenda of the ninth session of the General Assembly in view of impending negotiations between France and Morocco, the consideration of the item was, however, postponed. In 1956 Morocco attained its independence.

Towards the end of 1954, the heroic Algerian people rose in insurrection against French colonial rule. The following year, Pakistan, along with some other African-Asian states decided in the Bandung Conference to support

the Algerian demand for independence and asked for the consideration of the question by the United Nations. France challenged the competence of the General Assembly to discuss the question, again invoking the argument of domestic jurisdiction. The Chairman of the Pakistan Delegation, the late Mr. Mohammed Ali of Bogra, in refuting the French argument, said:

"For over a hundred years the rulers of Algeria have pursued a policy of assimilation, to make the native population French in feeling, and thinking, to fit them into the procrustean bed of French civilization and way of life for the greater glory and power of France. But the people of Algeria have stubbornly resisted this policy of assimilation and integration and remain adamantly Algerian, apart in language, religion, culture and way of life from their self-constituted benefactors. Why? Although Algeria is claimed to be as much a part and parcel of France as Bittany or Savey, yet there is no equality of status between Algeria and the other departments of France. There is no equality in the rights of franchise, political representation, or participation in the Government of the French Republic. The constitutional and juridical situation in Algeria, in law as well as in fact, rests on the principle of national and racial discrimination applied to all fields of life. Therefore, though France claims that Algerians are French citizens under her law, they remain French subjects in practice."

In the following year, Pakistan co-sponsored a draft resolution recognizing the right of the people of Algeria to self-determination and inviting France and the Algerian people to enter into immediate negotiations for a cessation of hostilities and bringing about a peaceful settlement in accordance with the principles of the U.N. Charter. This draft resolution was not adopted.

When, in 1959, I led the Pakistan Delegation to the General Assembly we extended our fullest support to the Algerian cause. Pakistan was unanimously requested by the Asian-African Group to be the sole sponsor and mover of a draft resolution on behalf of the Group calling for the recognition of Algeria's right to self-determination and independence and for negotiations between the Government of France and representatives of the FLN for a peaceful settlement in accordance with the principles of the Charter.

Speaking before the General Assembly in 1960, I again referred to Algeria, "that strife-torn land where the blood of patriots still flows in their fight for freedom." I went on to say:

"Let me declare here that the sympathies of the people of Pakistan are with the valiant sons of Algeria, fighting heroically for their freedom. At a time when so many countries on the continent of Africa are taking

their place in this Assembly, it is with great sorrow that we note the absence of Algeria."

In August, 1961, Pakistan took the bold step of according formal recognition to the provisional Government of Algeria in exile. This action was hailed not only by Algeria, but by all African people. We took this step despite the risk of losing French support in the Security Council on the Kashmir question. One must here pay a tribute to President De Gaulle. As a great statesman he understood that our action was prompted by our respect for the principle of self-determination and not by any ill-will towards France, a country with which Pakistan has always maintained warm and cordial relations.

Later, in December, 1961, Pakistan on behalf of thirty-five states, moved in the General Assembly a resolution urging the French Government to redress the grievances of Algerian prisoners in France and thus to bring about an immediate termination of their hunger strikes. This resolution was adopted by the General Assembly. The hunger strikes ended and an atmosphere conducive to a Franco-Algerian settlement was thus created. Finally, President De Gaulle conceded independence to Algeria and also set in motion in Africa a gigantic process of decolonization as a result of which all French African territories emerged as sovereign independent states and were admitted as members of the United Nations. This was a magnificent manifestation of the highest traditions of French liberalism.

Let me now turn to our relations with the Arab countries of the Middle East.

Among them, the United Arab Republic occupies a position of pivotal importance, not only because of its size, strategic position and cultural traditions, but also because of the radical changes in its internal life and international status, which have come in the wake of the Nasser revolution. The United Arab Republic plays a pre-eminent role in the affairs of the Arab world. For this reason and also because of its Islamic orientation, Pakistan has always placed the highest emphasis on the promotion of fraternal relations with this country. That being so, it is a matter of profound regret to us that, from time to time, Pakistan-United Arab Republic relations have been subject to strain and stress.

As in the pre-Pakistan period, we have always given our support to Egypt in its struggle against imperialism. We backed the Egyptian demand for the evacuation of British occupation forces from the Suez Canal Zone and for the negotiation of a new settlement of the problem of Anglo-Egyptian Sudan. In this matter, Pakistan was instrumental in promoting the resumption of negotiations between Egypt and the United Kingdom which had reached a deadlock.

President Gamal Abdul Nasser chose non-alignment between the two power blocs as the basis of his foreign policy. Pakistan, on the other hand, concluded in 1954 an agreement with the United States for military aid and later that year joined SEATO. These steps were taken to assure Pakistan security from the threat of Indian aggression. A year later, during the premiership of Nuri-as-Said, Iraq concluded with Turkey, for co-operation in defence, the Baghdad Pact. Iran and Pakistan also acceded to this Pact.

This development gave umbrage to Egypt, which regarded the Baghdad Pact as calculated to cause disunity and division in the Arab world, a renewed threat to it of imperialism because of Britain's membership of that Pact. Fears were expressed that Pakistan's policy of support for the Arabs of Palestine in particular and Arab liberation movements in general would no longer be sustained.

Pakistan soon demonstrated that these fears were totally unfounded. Membership of the Baghdad Pact and SEATO did not inhibit Pakistan from pursuing its traditional policy of supporting Arab aspirations and those of other people of Asia and Africa against all forms and manifestations of imperialism and colonialism. In fact, Pakistan used the forum provided by these Pacts to promote the causes of fraternal countries.

After the reversal of the United States offer to finance construction of the Aswan Dam, President Nasser nationalized the Suez Canal Company. Pakistan upheld the right of Egypt, as a sovereign state, to nationalize any undertaking within its territorial jurisdiction.

Pakistan's interest in maintaining freedom of navigation through the Canal was direct and immediate. At the time of its nationalization, 56% of Pakistan's exports and 49% of its imports passed through that international waterway. Nevertheless, Pakistan publicly declared that its nationalization was a justifiable act. Pakistan directed its diplomacy to dissuading the British Government from resorting to armed action to impose international control or to attempt to overthrow the Nasser regime.

In the London Conference, which was convened on the initiative of Mr. John Foster Dulles, to consider the situation, Pakistan reaffirmed its position that nationalization of the Suez Canal was in consonance with the sovereign prerogatives of Egypt and that a peaceful solution of the Anglo-French dispute with Egypt should be found through negotiation. The Pakistan delegation also successfully pressed amendments to substantially modify Western proposals. Pakistan was motivated by the desire to avert an imminent threat of Anglo-French invasion by keeping open the door for a negotiated settlement with President Nasser and thereby to frustrate the aims of those Powers which were determined to serve an ultimatum on him. Pakistan warned against the violation of the Charter

of the United Nations such as an attempt to dictate terms to President Nasser. It opposed the proposal to set up a Suez Canal Users' Association and suggested that the users should negotiate directly with Egypt. This stand taken by Pakistan, and some other countries, prevented the establishment of the Canal Users' Association.

When the Menzies negotiations with President Nasser failed, and the invasion of Suez took place, the people of Pakistan rose as one man to condemn the aggression of Britain, France and Israel. For weeks, cities and towns all over Pakistan resounded with denunciation of the three powers and with expressions of sympathy and support for the people of Egypt.

In the United Nations, Pakistan was actively associated with every move to bring about a cease-fire, the withdrawal of the invading forces and the despatch of a United Nations Emergency Force.

President Nasser was not entirely satisfied with the attitude of Pakistan in the first and second London Conferences. At the time of the Anglo-French-Israeli invasion of Egypt, President Nasser believed that Pakistan's support to his country could have been more positive and forthright. This belief led him not to let the Prime Minister of Pakistan visit Egypt nor to agree to the inclusion of a Pakistani contingent in the United Nations Emergency Force. Propaganda against Pakistan as a Baghdad Pact country were intensified.

With the overthrow of the monarchy in Iraq in July, 1958 and the withdrawal of that country from the Baghdad Pact, there was a noticeable improvement in the attitude of the United Arab Republic towards Pakistan. After the revolution in Pakistan in October, 1958, and the removal from power of politicians against some of whom President Nasser had a sense of grievance, the improvement of relations between the two countries was further accelerated.

In 1960, the UAR President visited Pakistan and had useful discussions with President Ayub Khan. This led to a better mutual appreciation of the interests and policies of the two countries. The President of Pakistan paid a return visit to the UAR where he was given a warm and enthusiastic reception. His speech in Cairo, analysing the ills of Muslim societies, and his call for a progressive outlook and modernistic approach to the problems confronting them, made a deep impression throughout the Middle East.

In 1962 and 1963, there was some retrogression in the relations between the United Arab Republic and Pakistan. The former objected to the sale of rifles and ammunition by Pakistan to Saudi Arabia, on the ground that these arms were being passed on to the royalist forces in Yemen, who were fighting against the republican government and the UAR forces

supporting it. The sale of arms to Saudi Arabia was a normal government to government transaction under an agreement entered into in December, 1961 and the Saudi Government denied that it was supplying the royalists with Pakistan weapons. Nevertheless in deference to the United Arab Republic Pakistan stopped the sale of weapons to Saudi Arabia particularly as it had never been Pakistan's policy to take sides in inter-Arab disputes. In addition to this, Pakistan recognized the new regime in Yemen.

While there is deep fraternal feeling in Pakistan for the United Arab Republic, the latter country's delegation in the Security Council, when the Kashmir dispute was discussed by it in the first half of 1962, adopted an attitude which was deeply regretted in this country. More recently the Indo-UAR Agreement of 1964 for collaboration in the production of super-sonic planes has aroused Pakistan's concern, for that would facilitate the acquisition by India of greater air offensive capacity. Nevertheless, Pakistan continues to seek a closer relationship with the United Arab Republic.

With Iraq, Saudi Arabia, Jordan, Syria, Yemen and Lebanon, we have most cordial relations. Neither changes of governments nor of policy have marred the warmth of these relations. While Pakistan has recognized that a non-aligned policy may suit these countries, they have also displayed an understanding of the special problems which led Pakistan to join the alliances. Even our most virulent critics recognize that Pakistan's membership of CENTO is not aimed against any of the countries of the Middle East, or of any other region, but it has in fact enabled Pakistan to project the Arab view-point in yet another international forum. Iraq's decision in July, 1958, to withdraw from the Baghdad Pact had little effect on the friendly relations between Pakistan and Iraq. This again proves that Pakistan's friendship towards the Muslim countries transcends considerations of policy.

President Abdus Salam Arif visited Pakistan in April, 1964. He had fruitful talks with the President of Pakistan. The joint communique issued after the talks reaffirmed Iraq's support for an early settlement of the Kashmir dispute in the spirit of Afro-Asian solidarity and in conformity with the Charter and resolutions of the United Nations. The wide measure of accord between Iraq and Pakistan was again demonstrated by the support and understanding which President Arif showed towards Pakistan in its current crisis with India.

Saudi Arabia is the guardian of the two Holy Cities of Islam, Mecca and Medina. So profound is the attachment of the Muslims of the sub-continent to these sacred cities that to safeguard them, they made during and after the First World War, untold sacrifices. The Khilafat Movement, it will be remembered, had as one of its aims the preservation of the Holy Places

and the Hedjaz from the threat of alien rule.

Viewed against this background, it will be obvious that the bonds between Pakistan and Saudi Arabia are very strong indeed. It is a matter of special satisfaction to Pakistan that it has been able to extend advice and technical assistance to Saudi Arabia in defence and other fields and that Pakistani doctors, engineers, consultants and workers in oil industry are playing their part in the progress of that country.

Jordan, the custodian of the Masjidal Aqsa, has always occupied a place of special affection in the hearts of Pakistanis and has attracted thousands of them as pilgrims. Pakistan's relations with Jordan have always been very cordial and a large measure of political co-operation has existed between the two countries. The suggestion made by Sir Mohammad Zafrullah Khan, when he was Foreign Minister of Pakistan, to convene at Jerusalem a conference of Muslim countries to evolve a policy for united action to counter the menace of Israel is a manifestation of the sympathy of Pakistan for Jordan.

King Hussein paid a state visit to Pakistan in 1955. In a joint Pakistan-Jordan communique issued after the Pakistan Prime Minister's visit to Jordan in August, 1957, the two countries pledged themselves to co-operate with each other in pursuance of their common interests and policies. In April, 1964, the people-to-people delegation led by Mir Waiz Mohammad Yusuf of Kashmir visited Jordan and was accorded a warm welcome and assured of the full support of the Jordanian Government to the right to self-determination of the people of Kashmir.

Damascus has been one of the great power centres of the Muslim world. Pakistan's relations with Syria have always been cordial. When Syria joined the United Arab Republic, Pakistan, consistently with its policy of goodwill and sympathy towards the movement for Arab unity, extended its welcome to the Union. Later when Syria decided to separate from it, Pakistan took a non-partisan attitude but noted with satisfaction that Arab unity remained the goal of Syrian policy.

Historically, Lebanon has been a meeting place of empires and civilizations of Asia and Europe. The Lebanese have been a great sea-faring and mercantile people. Their ancestors, the Phonecians, who founded Carthage, and are credited with the invention of the alphabet, have through the ages demonstrated a remarkable genius for trade and commerce. Contacts between Pakistan and Lebanon have with the introduction of direct air service greatly expanded in recent years. It can be confidently predicted that the exchange of visits by scholars and businessmen of the two countries will prove mutually beneficial.

Pakistan did not immediately recognize the Revolutionary Government in Yemen in 1963. This was because of Pakistan's policy of non-interference

in inter-Arab controversies. But since then not only have Pakistan's diplomatic representatives paid visits to that country but Pakistan has also been associated with the U.N. Observation Mission in Yemen. Pakistan has expressed the hope that peaceful conditions will soon be restored in Yemen and a political settlement acceptable to the people of Yemen and also to Saudi Arabia and the UAR will be reached which will promote reforms in Yemen and remove a cause of division within the Arab world.

With the Shaikhdom of Kuwait, Pakistan has established cordial and friendly relations. Pakistan opened a Consulate General which has since been raised to the level of an Embassy. A number of visits have been exchanged by ministers of the two countries and there is no doubt that fruitful and mutually advantageous co-operation between them will continue to expand.

South Arabia, which has long been struggling against colonial rule, cannot much longer be denied its legitimate demand for freedom and independence. Pakistan has joined with Arab and other African-Asian states in supporting, in the United Nations, resolutions favouring freedom and self-determination for South Arabia.

Pakistan's policy towards the Arab world is to support all measures unanimously accepted by the Arab states. We welcome all manifestations of the unity and solidarity of the Arab world and acclaim its economic and social achievements. We regret the transient differences that exist between some Arab states and maintain a policy of strict non-interference and non-involvement in inter-Arab disputes. Pakistan will continue to extend its full and unqualified support to the movement for political, economic and cultural co-operation between Arab states in the interest of their own collective security and welfare as conducive to solidarity among Muslim countries and Afro-Asian unity. This is not merely a matter of policy for Pakistan, but represents the heart's desire of every citizen of this country.

The emergence of independent nations in Africa opened up a new vista of co-operation between the peoples of this great continent and those of other continents. This is a matter of special gratification for Pakistan for Africa occupies a very important position in the world of Islam. A large number of the inhabitants of this continent are followers of Islam. Twenty-two out of thirty-five independent African countries have Muslim majority populations. But the importance of Africa in the Muslim world derives not only from the large number of Muslims inhabiting this continent, but also from the notable contribution made by it to the concept of Islamic universality.

Africa has now broken the shackles of alien bondage and Muslims of this vigorous continent are taking an active interest in the revival of the dynamic values of Islam as a factor in Asian unity. Sir Ahmadu Bello, the

Sarduana of Sokoto, and the Prime Minister of Northern Nigeria, has carried the torch of Islamic renaissance far and wide. Somalia was the scene of the Sixth Conference of the World Muslim Congress. Mr. Aden Abdullah Osman, the President of Somalia, has long been known for his interest in this Congress. African delegations are also playing a prominent role in Islamic conferences outside their continent, such as the African-Asian Islamic Conference held in Bandung in March 1965. Pakistan looks forward to forging new ties of friendship and cordiality with the countries of Africa, thus giving further momentum to Afro-Asian solidarity.

Africa is a continent in revolt, striving for full emancipation from colonial domination. The movement for independence from colonial rule has already achieved impressive results, except in South Africa, Angola, Mozambique and some other areas, where the liberation struggle continues. The task in Africa now is to consolidate the independence and sovereignty of the newly liberated nations.

Islam is in the forefront of the revolution in Africa. The demand for human dignity, equality and social justice, which is urgent, has found a ready response from the proselytising elements of Islam, which have merged and identified themselves with the revolution. Alien missionaries are fighting a losing battle against the revolutionary principles of Islam, which derives strength from its indigenous character and from its unsurpassed record as the greatest moral force against racial discrimination.

It is the universality of the spirit of Islam, its emphasis on brotherhood and equality between man and man, its inherent vitality and vigour, which have led to its fusion with the progressive revolution in Africa. This revolution and Islam's contribution to the emancipation and progress of the African people have a significance not only for the continent of Africa but for the world at large.

The future of mankind clearly depends upon its ability to develop bonds of fraternity between peoples with different racial and cultural backgrounds in different parts of the world. For that reason the role of Islam in Africa is not only of immediate importance also because the success of the African struggle for progress, emancipation and solidarity is a matter of vital concern to humanity at large.

From the vibrant scene of resurgent Africa, we come to the ancient civilization of China. Relations between the territories which today constitute Pakistan and China were established at a very early stage of their known history. Pre-Muslim relations of the sub-continent with the general region of China remained strictly confined to the spiritual field. Such cultural intercourse as is known to have taken place was a corollary to the visits of Chinese Buddhists to their places of pilgrimage in the sub-continent.

With the spread of Islam in the Central Asian region and the

Indo-Pakistan sub-continent and with the travels of Muslim geographers, explorers and historians, definite over-land routes between Central Asia and some regions of China were identified. Similarly, Muslim mariners, whose mercantile activities extended to the Malayan Archipelago, came into direct contact with Chinese merchants and a sea-route was established all the way from China to the Mediterranean.

After Halaku (Hulagu) Khan's depredations and with the fall of the Abbasid Caliphate and the resulting anarchy in Iran, the established over-land trade routes were closed. This led to the discovery of a transverse route from Kashgar to Gilgit and down the Indus Valley to Debal (present-day Thatta), on the Arabian Sea, from where merchandise was transhipped to Western lands.

This new route brought the sub-continent, especially its Western part, into intimate political, cultural, commercial and diplomatic contact with both China and Central Asia. One of the most famous Embassies, exchanged between the Chinese Emperors and the Tughlaq Sultans of the sub-continent, was led by the famous traveller Ibne Batuta. This Embassy, which was in response to the one sent to Muhammad Tughlaq by the Chinese Emperor, Hyan Ti, is important because it set the pattern of trade between China and the sub-continent under Muslim rule. The exchange of goods brought in its wake the exchange of craftsmanship, technological skills and fine arts.

There is a large Muslim population in North-West China and its Sinkiang province. Good neighbourly relations between Pakistan and the People's Republic of China, once again enable the resumption of its historical and cultural links with this important segment of the Chinese population after a virtual rupture of contact during the period of colonial rule in the sub-continent.

The Central Asian Republics of the Soviet Union contain a sizable Muslim population. With them, the relations of our people are even more intimate. From this region came the pioneers of Muslim rule in India. The names of Samarkand and Bukhara invoke romantic feelings of kinship among our people even to this day. In the wake of independence, a growing awareness of our historical and cultural affinities with Central Asia has made an important contribution to our success in the quest for good neighbourliness and friendship with the Soviet Union.

With Iran and Turkey, the foreign policy of Pakistan reflects a continuity of the traditional sense of identity felt by the Muslims of the sub-continent with those nations. Since independence, Pakistan's relations with them have been further developed and consolidated. Common membership of CENTO was one of the consequences of these relations. Pakistan's sympathy and support for Iran and Turkey on all questions

involving their rights and interests has been unequivocal.

Reference has already been made to Pakistan's sentiments towards Turkey as reflected in the Khilafat Movement. However, our relations with modern Turkey are based on the same spirit of kinship and fellow-feeling which inspired our previous generation to treat the cause of Turkey as its own and to make monumental sacrifices in solidarity with the Turkish people. The memory of Kamal Ataturk, the Father of modern Turkey, is venerated in Pakistan as much as it is in the land of his birth.

With Iran, our people are bound by innumerable historical, cultural and ethnic links that go back to ancient history. Notwithstanding two centuries of colonial domination, the people of Pakistan have retained the rich heritage of their intimate past association with Iran. The feeling of fraternity and oneness that the people of Pakistan have for the people of Iran, who are in more than one sense the progenitors of the Muslim culture of the sub-continent, is a living reality even to this day. The people of Pakistan hold the Shahinshah of Iran in high esteem and value his personal contribution to the continued development of friendship between our two countries. The brotherly equation between the Shahinshah and the President of Pakistan is a symbol of the essential unity of our two peoples.

When, in the early fifties, the Government of Iran nationalized the oil industry and terminated the concession of the Anglo-Iranian Oil Company, Pakistan upheld the sovereign right of Iran to take this action. The boundary between the two countries had remained unsettled during the entire period of British rule. Agreement as to its alignment has now been reached and the boundary demarcated by the experts of the two countries working in cordial cooperation.

At an historic meeting between the Heads of State of Iran, Pakistan and Turkey, held in Istanbul in July 1964, an agreement was reached between the three countries for establishing Regional Co-operation for Development. The initiative taken in this matter by the President of Pakistan was indeed symbolic of the true nature of Muslim renaissance. Notwithstanding the many problems facing each of the three countries, they decided to launch a supranational organization, which has been acclaimed as a development of great future significance.

When the Cyprus question was referred to the United Nations General Assembly in 1954 and discussed that year and in the following year, the Pakistan delegation defended the historical and legal claims of Turkey in respect of the island. In 1957, regarding the Greek delegation's resolution that Cyprus be granted the right to self-determination, the Pakistan delegation pointed out that the resolution had been so drafted as to imperil the human rights and legitimate aspirations of Turkish Cypriots. In 1960, under the Treaty of Zurich, Cyprus achieved independence, guaranteed by

Turkey, Greece and the United Kingdom. The right of Turkey to intervene in the event of a violation of the Constitution of Cyprus, which formed an integral part of the Treaty, was expressly recognized.

Expressing the concern of the Government and people of Pakistan about the serious situation as it had developed in Cyprus, on 27 December, 1963, I said :

> "The Agreements which brought about the settlement of the problem of Cyprus have to be respected, as they are solemn international commitments.
>
> "We are with Turkey in her moment of crisis and whatever cooperation may be needed from Pakistan will be extended in the fullest measure".

With Afghanistan, we have ethnic, historic and linguistic ties. Our mutual associations go back to the dawn of history, the time of the influx of the Aryans, more than three thousand years ago.

It was to be expected that upon the emergence of Pakistan as an independent State, Afghanistan would develop with it close friendly ties. However, there were barriers of isolation which had been created during the era of colonial rule in this region. In the early stages, in the relations between the two countries, there were unmistakable signs of reserve and suspicion on the part of Afghanistan. Pakistan, however, always maintained that the two countries had far too much in common to permit any problem to permanently detract from the natural development of close and good neighbourly relations between them. In fact, objectively speaking, with no other country has Afghanistan or Pakistan so much in common as with each other.

Recent developments, however, indicate an encouraging trend. The cordial meeting between King Zahir Shah and President Ayub Khan in June 1964 set the tone for further improvement of relations between the two countries, of which the Transit Trade Agreement successfully concluded in February 1965 is a clear manifestation. It may be mentioned here that this Agreement provides for Afghanistan such facilities and liberal terms as are among the best in the world. It is in striking contrast to the Transit Trade Agreement between India and Nepal, which after placing every conceivable difficulty in the way of land-locked Nepal, provides it only with limited facilities.

The history of Pakistan's relations with Indonesia is also conditioned by unfailing sympathy of the Muslims of this sub-continent for their brethren in other countries. The people of Indonesia in their struggle for freedom had all the support of the people of Pakistan. Pakistanis in Indonesia fought side by side with their Indonesian brethren in the latter's war of liberation. Pakistan, an infant state, as it was in those days, extended its whole-hearted support to their cause both in the United Nations

and outside it and rejoiced in their success and the establishment of the independent Republic of Indonesia. In their subsequent struggle over West Irian, Indonesia had the full backing of Pakistan, which sent a sizable contingent of troops to assist the United Nations in its supervisory task of transferring from Dutch to Indonesian control.

The Government of Pakistan extended its hand of friendship and whole-hearted cooperation to Indonesia on every occasion. There has been quite significant economic cooperation between the two countries, which have the largest Muslim populations in the world. In the development of even closer relations between them, an historic event took place, when at a Conference held in Karachi in March, 1965, "IPECC" (Indonesia-Pakistan Economic and Cultural Cooperation) was established. This provided for RCD-type Cooperation in order to maximise trade between the two countries and promote joint ventures in industry and cooperation in communications to their mutual advantage. It also provided for the development of cultural contacts to further strengthen the ties between the two peoples.

Cooperation between Pakistan and Indonesia has been significant in various fields, particularly in international affairs. They were both co-sponsors of the First African-Asian Conference which adopted the historic Bandung principles, now recognized as the universal norm of conduct between states.

The exchange of State visits between the President of Pakistan and the President of Indonesia were occasions for important discussions between the two leaders, which resulted in an even closer mutual understanding. Recognizing the right to self-determination of all peoples, Indonesia extended its fullest support to Pakistan in regard to the Kashmir dispute.

The feeling of identity that the people of Pakistan have with their co-religionists has been an important factor in its relations with South East Asia in general. Even before the independence of Malaya there was considerable contact between the leaders of Pakistan and Malaya. In 1955, Tunku Rahman on his way to London for independence talks broke journey in Karachi and had consultations with the Pakistan Prime Minister. Needless to say that Pakistan extended its whole-hearted support to Malaya's demand for independence. Pakistan also made an important contribution to the work of the Reid Commission, which in 1957 drew up the Constitution of Malaya. There had been exchange of numerous visits, the most notable of which was the visit to Pakistan of the Paramount Ruler of Malaya in December, 1961 and that of Prime Minister Tunku Abdur Rahman in October, 1962.

With the formation of Malaysia, difficulties arose in that region, which have yet to be resolved. In September, 1963, President Ayub Khan wrote

to the Prime Ministers of Indonesia, Malaysia and the Philippines, expressing his concern. Again in April, 1964, the President offered to the three parties facilities for their meeting in Pakistan, should they desire to do so. The President also placed his good offices at their disposal. In July, 1964, the President made a statement in London, expressing the hope that Indonesia and Malaysia would continue to strive for an amicable settlement. He said that the important thing was that the dialogue should not be interrupted. Pakistan is undoubtedly concerned over the persistence of this dispute between countries with both of whom it has cordial and friendly relations. It shall continue to advocate an amicable settlement through peaceful means. Our efforts will be directed only towards that end.

I have recounted some of the contributions that Pakistan has made to the cause of Muslims in other parts of the world and attempted to illustrate the consistent good-will, support and indentification which have characterized our relations with Muslim world. In doing so, I had no intention of claiming credit for Pakistan.

Pakistan's policy towards Muslim countries is not based on any desire for gain or appreciation. It is based on more fundamental considerations. As has been shown, even before the inception of the Pakistan movement, the leaders of Muslim renaissance in the sub-continent had identified themselves with the greater cause of the awakening of the Islamic world as a whole.

The ideology of Pakistan was not only confined to the need for the emancipation of the Muslims of the sub-continent. It was vitally concerned with the manifestation in the twentieth century, of Islamic values of social justice and universal brotherhood. Pakistan was thus conceived with a very pronounced external purpose and it has consistently sought to discharge this obligation in the field of international affairs—an obligation which it had inherited with the very birth of Pakistan as an independent state. The promotion of amity, peace and justice in international affairs has, therefore, been an important principle with Pakistan in the conduct of its foreign policy. Its ideological basis, its dedication to the cause of emancipation, solidarity and progress of Islam in the twentieth century and its zealous quest for peace with justice and equity and for the fulfilment of its purpose in the scheme of things in the Muslim world were decisive factors.

While Pakistanis share in the joys and sorrows of Muslim peoples all over the world, it is the welfare of the Muslims of India that is closest to their hearts. This is only natural, because the Muslims of Pakistan and India have the same heritage and history and were but one community until 1947, when independence came to the two countries. It is for this reason that Pakistan has always been deeply concerned with the problems of the

fifty million Muslims of India.

The creation of a separate state comprising the Muslim majority areas of the sub-continent, was designed to enable the two nations to live separately, so that friction and strife that marred the relations between Muslims and Hindus should be eliminated. With the partition of the sub-continent on the basis of the two nations theory, the minorities in both the states would, it was hoped, be able to lead a life free from fear and intimidation, which had become their lot in the persistent conflict between the two communities.

However, the holocaust let loose at the very time of partition, in 1947, was a clear indication that the fate of Muslims in India was uncertain. Although, under the Liaquat-Nehru Agreement of 1950, the Government of India and Pakistan pledged themselves to ensure to their respective minorities complete equality of citizenship and full security in respect of life, culture, property and personal freedom, the position of Muslims in India has gone from bad to worse. There have been, in India since 1950, more than 550 anti-Muslim riots. Hardly any festival of the Muslims has passed without their community being subjected to attacks of communal frenzy in one part of India or another. The existence of the Muslims as a distinct cultural group is in peril despite India's protestations of secularism. The newly written accounts of Indian history go so far as to completely ignore the great contributions which Muslims made towards the culture and civilization of India. The aims of the majority community can be judged from a statement of the President of Hindu Mahasabha. He said:

> "Methods have to be devised whereby these elements, that is the Muslims, can be merged with the flow of national life in the country, which is nothing other than Hindu."

A number of other Hindu leaders have voiced similar sinister intentions towards the Muslim population of India.

As if political, economic and cultural disintegration of Muslims was not enough, certain elements of the majority community in India have launched an organized campaign of genocide of Muslims. Treating the Muslims as hostages in the political vendetta against Pakistan, the Indian authorities have done little to protect the lives of innocent Muslims, of whom thousands have been massacred in the oft-recurring communal riots. Selig Harrison, a keen observer of the contemporary Indian scene, writing in the American quarterly "Foreign Affairs" of January, 1965, said that in India, secularism was dead. He added:

> "The traditionalist tone in social patterns has a political parallel in the slow stirrings of a coarse-grain nationalism which is frankly, even belligerently, Hindu in its inspiration . . .It is not enough that a unified State with a Hindu majority—clearly dominant over a Muslim minority,

now reduced to 11 per cent—has been established at long last in the Indian sub-continent . . ."

On our Eastern frontiers, India has launched a most callous drive against its Muslim citizens, forcing them to leave their homes and seek shelter in East Pakistan. Half a million helpless Muslims from India have so far taken refuge in East Pakistan. This is a cynical manifestation of India's 'secularism'. By using Indian Muslims in this ruthless and diabolic fashion as human pawns, India hopes to score against Pakistan. Such utter lack of concern for civilized standards is a blot on the conscience of mankind. India thinks that through these forcible evictions, it will gain on two fronts, *i.e.* eliminate the fifty million Muslims of India and at the same time bring unbearable pressure on Pakistan. India does not stop to think that long before it reaches either of these goals, it would have succeeded in bringing about its own down-fall. Callousness only begets callousness. India will court disaster at the hands of human indignation against barbarian practices. The present leadership of India which metes out such unjust and inhuman treatment to one section of its people can retain neither the loyalty nor the support of its other sections for any length of time.

The Muslim minority of India is faced with an ordeal and a threat which should evoke the concern of all people who respect human rights. The minority problem in India is not a political, but a human problem. All that Pakistan is anxious to secure for the Muslims of India is that they should be delivered from threat to their lives, their culture and their possessions and that they should have in actual fact the equality of citizenship promised in the Indian Constitution, on the secular character of which India prides itself.

Pakistan has repeatedly appealed to India to stop the persecution of Muslims and to protect their elementary human rights. Pakistan has also brought the matter to the attention of the United Nations with a view to stirring the conscience of the world about it. World opinion, particularly public opinion in the Muslim countries, can be a most potent factor in persuading the Government of India to ensure that the principles proclaimed in the Indian Constitution are applied also to its Muslim citizens.

Under international law and the Charter of the United Nations, the universal observance of respect for human rights, regardless of the race or religion of the affected people, is a subject of legitimate concern to all states, individually and collectively. Needless to say that it is in India's own larger interest that fifty million Indians should be allowed to live in safety instead of being sacrificed on the altar of prejudice, merely because they are Muslims.

The Muslims of India have given much and sacrificed much for Muslims

everywhere. Is it too much to hope that they in their turn will not be abandoned by the Muslim world?

The poignant position of the fifty million Muslim minority in India and the discrimination and deprivations Muslims continue to suffer calls for united action on the part of Muslim peoples who have the ability and power to join together in defence of freedom, justice and fundamental human rights.

The injustice which the people of Jammu and Kashmir have had to suffer at the hands of India presents to the world of Islam its greatest challenge. If Islam is to remain a force of liberation, a force dedicated to the liquidation of oppression, injustice and tyranny, a force sworn to uphold the rights and dignities and just causes of suffering humanity, a beginning will have to be made in Kashmir. It is here that contemporary Islam faces its severest trial.

India remains in illegal occupation of Kashmir in flagrant violation of its international commitments. The people of Kashmir continue to be denied their right to self determination and to suffer under the heel of Indian colonial domination. They continue to be deprived of their fundamental right to decide their own destiny. A reign of terror has been let loose in the Valley to crush the spirit of the valiant freedom fighters. Indian forces persist in imposing their tyranny on the unarmed and helpless Muslims. Their leaders rot in jails and yet the struggle continues, and will continue.

There is gratifying evidence that the reawakening Muslim peoples are not unmindful of their obligations. After two centuries of stagnation and apathy, the resurgent Muslim world is assisting itself in world affairs. The most recent domonstration of its solidarity was witnessed at the African-Asian Muslim Peoples Conference held at Djakarta in March, 1965. Representatives from thirty three countries took part in this Conference, which was the first of its kind. The Conference stressed the need for collaboration amongst Muslim countries and peoples for protecting their interest, promoting their welfare and safeguarding their security. At this Conference, President Soekarno in an inspiring address exhorted Muslims to safeguard their freedom through progress and to re-build a prosperous and better world for themselves.

Taken collectively, the countries of the Muslim world of today spread from the Atlantic to the Pacific. They differ in their forms of government, political organization, and in their economic and social systems. Their national interests, as dictated by geo-political and historical factors, need to be harmonized.

Let us examine the concept of nationalism in Islam and see if it is at variance with the universal brotherhood of mankind as preached by Islam. When Islam over-flowed the confines of Arabia and, with irresistible force,

reached the far corners of the civilized world of those days, it was only the spirit of its ideology and its mission which remained unitary. In its application it assumed diverse federal characteristics. At no time in the history of Islam did any central authority dominate its far-flung components. On the contrary, often the kingdoms on its peripheries sought to identify themselves with the centre. We see, therefore, Islam acting as a positive unifying force and bringing about a complete harmonization of an outward looking nationalism with a progressive international unity. Islam has abundantly illustrated the complete reconciliation of nationalism with internationalism.

It is true that a lasting association cannot be based on doctrine alone, for this would inevitably lead to disagreements resulting from differences in interpretation. Nor can we hope to build on nostalgia or sentiment. The answer is to be found in a unity based on the principles of peace, justice and brotherhood and dedication to the struggle against tyranny which are essential ingredients of Islam. We must aim at a unity based on enlightenment—on reform and reconstruction, acting as an impetus to international co-operation, in collaboration with and as partisans in the common struggle against domination and indeed as a spearhead of progressive and revolutionary forces against colonialism and imperialism.

The future of the Islamic world is beginning to take shape. The Arab States come together periodically at the summit level. So do the Maghreb States, the RCD and the IPECC countries. In their totality, the growing contacts between Muslim nations constitute a force of considerable significance. What needs to be done is to enlarge the existing scope of such contacts through multilateral meetings of Heads of States and Governments. If this is done, it would be capable of giving a powerful impetus to the renaissance of Islam in the twentieth century.

The Muslims of the sub-continent have played their part in the contemporary revival of Islam. From the Pan Islamic attitudes of the concluding phases of the Khilafat period, there has been a rapid evolution. Modern revivalists such as Syed Ahmed Khan and Syed Ameer Ali, and activists like Allama Iqbal have carried the evolution to its present phase, in which the civilization of Islam is engaged in the most crucial task of providing a sheet-anchor for the elimination of the last vestiges of domination and exploitation. The contemporary role of Islam is consistent with that which it played in the struggle of mankind against tyranny, until the Muslim society was itself weakened by schisms which led to its degeneration and decay before it fell in the face of imperialist onslaughts. The spirit of Islam is now finding its natural expression in its association with the call for the establishment of a new world order based on equality, justice and fraternity. It is only the success with which the struggle against

exploitation and domination can be carried to a satisfactory conclusion that will determine whether or not we can see the dawn of a new era in the affairs of man.

With the revolutionary discoveries of science and technology, new vistas, and indeed new dimensions, are being added to human experience. The present only provides a glimpse of the dynamism which will be the hallmark of our world of tomorrow. Citizens of the future will need an atmosphere of absolute equality and social justice, if they are to succeed in meeting the unprecedented challenge which they will have to face. To achieve these conditions our generation would need to make monumental effort and prepare for physical and intellectual discipline of the highest order. In a broad sense our endeavour has already begun. But it would need to be supported and given direction. The egalitarian principles of Islam would need to be practised and manifested. The intelligentsia of the Muslim world would do well to establish its own clearing house of new ideas and fresh interpretations of known values. National leaders would need to have a high degree of awareness of movements not only within Islam, but in the entire world. National policies would need to be harmonized with regional needs which, in their turn, would have to take into account the realities of the international situation as a whole.

Without setting our sights too high, we can hope to see the gradual evolution of regional institutions, such as RCD and IPECC, a greater measure of cohesion among the Arab states, closer institutional links between the countries of the Maghreb and reinforcement of the African personality. These and other developments would inevitably bring us to the next phase of co-operation which would include the development of inter-institutional relations between these various regional organizations.

Pakistan has a role of vital importance to play in this evolutionary phase. Its situation, on the periphery of the Middle East on the one hand and the Far East on the other, is in itself a compelling factor. Its ideological basis provides a motive power. It is the particular heritage of Pakistan, however, which is the most potent factor in the determination of the nature and scope of its role. The Muslims of Pakistan have, along with their Islamic fervour, inherited certain characteristics of all the great civilizations of the past. Through their association with the Buddhists and the Hindus, among whom they have lived for almost a thousand years, their contacts with Central Asia and indirectly with the ancient civilization of China and their association with the West, which has had its own impact, the followers of Islam in Pakistan have developed a unique cosmopolitan outlook. The totality of its circumstances are such that, in the world of tomorrow, Pakistan cannot but play a significant role.

Conceived as an ideological state, Pakistan is dedicated to the

manifestation of the most comprehensive code of social, economic and political conduct, aiming at the establishment of a truely egalitarian soceity and to the liquidation of disparity, discrimination and exploitation—in fact it is dedicated to the achievement of true equality and brotherhood in human relations. This embodiment of the values of Islam with its internal and external dimensions, finds itself in complete harmony with the most progressive, economic, political and social forces of the contemporary world.

If mankind is to avoid the many pitfalls which lie in its path, many a bridge will have to be built in the world of the future. In this context a mere glance at the human, political and physical geography of the world will show the importance of the situation of Pakistan. Situated as it is, one cannot conclude otherwise than to say that the bridges across Pakistan will carry for the world, the lifeblood of its future generations with all the promise of peace, brotherhood, progress and enlightenment—in fact the true ingredients of a better world.

If this conclusion as to our destiny should sound pretentious, one could quote from the renowned scholar Philip K. Hitti:

> "If some one in the first third of the seventh Christian century had had the audacity to prophesy that within a decade or so some unheralded, unforeseen power, from the hitherto barbarous and little known land of Arabia was to make its appearance, hurl itself against the only two world powers of the age, fall heir to the one (the Sasanid) and strip the other (the Byzantine) of its fairest provinces, he would undoubtedly have been declared a lunatic. Yet that was exactly what happened."

It was not so long ago when the idea of Pakistan was mooted, there was no dearth of skeptics who pointed out that it was nothing short of lunacy. After all, was it not Victor Hugo who said, "nothing is more powerful in the world than the force of an idea whose time has come?"

Broadcast in the National Hook-up on September 3, 1965

During the eighteen years that this country has been in existence, we have overcome one crisis after another. Today we are facing a situation in the State of Kashmir which threatens to confront us with the most momentous of all decisions that this Nation has taken in its eventful life.

The people of the State of Kashmir have risen in armed revolt against the tyranny of Indian bondage. Over the years India has closed one door after another on a peaceful settlement of the Kashmir dispute in her determination to deny to the people of the State of Kashmir their right to self-determination. It proceeded with measure after measure for the immoral and illegal integration of the State in flagrant violation of its own solemn pledges and commitments. It remained impervious to warning and counsels of moderation.

Contrary to the dictates of reason, and fortified by the massive arms aid which it obtained under the pretext of fighting China, India has continued on the war path going from one excess to another.

The people of Kashmir waited patiently for eighteen long years while every avenue was explored to persuade India to redeem its solemn pledges to the people of Kashmir, to Pakistan, and to the world. They have seen all their expectations belied and all their hopes frustrated by the obduracy of India. They have endured the terror let loose on them by no less than six divisions of the Indian Army. They have suffered tyranny and oppression beyond imagination.

In the State of Kashmir, India did not remain content with the denial of the right to self-determination to the people. It launched a barbaric policy of cold blooded and callous genocide with the sole objective of

eliminating the Muslim majority of the State of Kashmir by Hitlerite extermination. It unleashed all the horrors and inequities of imperialism, and re-enacted the entire gamut of colonialist devices against which generations of downtrodden humanity have struggled for emancipation. What makes this episode all the more tragic is that when the millions of Indian citizens had hardly completed rejoicing in the success of their own struggle for freedom, their leadership embarked on this senseless adventure to dominate the people of the State of Kashmir.

The heroic people of Kashmir have withstood the total onslaught of India's colonial rule with exemplary valour. They have gained the admiration of freedom-loving people throughout the world.

If only the late Prime Minister of India had paid heed to his own counsel, the tragedy of Kashmir might have been avoided. It was on the thirty-first of October, 1947, that Pandit Nehru, in a communication to the Prime Minister of Pakistan, stated:

> "Our assurance that we shall withdraw our troops from Kashmir as soon as peace and order are restored and leave the decision regarding the future of the State to the people of the State is not merely a promise to your Government but also to the people of Kashmir, to the world at large".

Not only was this undertaking never fulfilled but the successor of the late Prime Minister has gone ahead with the integration into India of the territory forcibly occupied by it and retained by the force of its arms.

It was Pandit Nehru himself who referred to the Lion of Kashmir, Shaikh Abdullah as, "a brave man and great leader of his people". This was on the Seventh of August 1952. However, history is replete with tragic ironies; and the people of Kashmir were doomed to victimization and ruthless oppression at the hands of those very people who had extended such categorical assurances and expressed such admiration for their great leader. After spending eleven years in jail, Shaikh Abdullah and his valiant lieutenant, Mirza Afzal Beg, are back in Indian jails while their undaunted followers continue the struggle for freedom.

I have dwelt at some length on the background which, to use the language of the poet, has now become "a part of yesterday's seven thousand years". It is a thing of the past. The valiant sons of Kashmir have risen and taken up arms to liquidate Indian domination over their home-land. They have taken recourse to their ultimate right to fight for their liberty. This is their natural right and it is in the nature of things. It is implicit in the immutable laws which inspire people in their yearning for freedom.

Support of freedom-fighters is enshrined in the hearts and minds of the entire freedom-loving humanity. The inherent right of a people to fight for their liberty from foreign domination has been given universal recognition.

It is not surprising, therefore, that the freedom-fighters in the State of Kashmir should have evoked the support and sympathy of the people of Pakistan who are their own flesh and blood. The Mujahideen in their struggle have the blessings and support of all freedom-loving people throughout the world. They are engaged in fighting for their freedom which the United Nations has failed to secure for them. They are fighting to achieve self-determination which was pledged to them by India and sanctified in the U.N. resolutions. They are not alone and they will never be alone. Theirs is a struggle which has the sanction of justice, a struggle which can only lead to glorious victory. The higher the price they have to pay for their freedom, the greater will be their glory in the achievement of it.

The brave freedom fighters of Kashmir have been branded by India as "Pakistani infiltrators". It is a gross travesty of truth and a slanderous vilification to call these galant men "infiltrators". Each one of them is a Salahuddin—a brave fighter for honour and dignity, a bastion against tyranny, and the embodiment of justice and freedom.

It is difficult to see how India's leadership can be so insensitive to the injustice and inhumanity of their own actions. They cannot but know where it will all end. They must realize that no amount of repression will be enough to extinguish the torch of freedom. Yet in this hour of their reckoning, instead of resorting to soul searching and atonement for the wrongs they have perpetrated on the innocent people of Kashmir, India's leadership continues on the path of devastation and deluge. Even now, in moving against the freedom-fighters with all its six divisions and more, India is engaged in carrying out inhuman reprisals against unarmed men, women and children. They have let loose a reign of terror in which the civilian population is being subjected to the most brutal atrocities—the looting and arson, the systematic sacking of village after village, the incarceration of countless thousands. These are the hard facts, the achievements of the Indian Army. The conscience of mankind revolts at this unprecedented genocide unleashed on the people of Kashmir by the armed might of India. The sacking of the entire Batamalu suburb of Srinagar on 14 August in which innocent men, women and children were burnt alive in hundreds will live in the memory of future generations of mankind as one of the worst examples of barbaric conduct in the twentieth century. It will rank with the massacres of Jalianwalla Bagh, Auschwitz and Belsen as a low-water mark of organized brutality. The memory of Batamalu will leave a deep scar in the minds of all those people who cherish humanity and value civilized conduct.

The utter futility of this deplorable genocide in Kashmir does not seem to trouble the conscience of India's leadership. They seem determined to

ride rough-shod over the most significant trend of our contemporary times which the force of resurgent national-freedom-movement represents. It is a sign of the worst possible form of shortsightedness that, instead of seeking peace, India has embarked on aggression. The cease-fire line, they have rendered sterile by refusing to honour the purpose for which it was established. They have now liquidated finally and torn up the last remnants of the arrangement which had been made for the maintenance of peace, an arrangement which was to lead to a settlement on the basis of a free and impartial plebiscite.

India has launched an undeclared war across the cease-fire line in Kashmir. We are neither surprised nor unprepared. There have been those who have tried hard to persuade us that India would not commit aggression against Pakistan. Fortunately for us, we have persisted in our conviction to the contrary, a conviction based on our own appreciation of the Indian threat. Pakistan, which has been designated by India as its enemy number one, has had to contend from its very birth with the belligerence of Indian leadership. Time and again, India manifested its aggressive actions. Starting from the mass-killings of the Muslims at the time of partition, through the forcible annexations of Junagadh, Manavadar, Mangrol, Hyderabad, Kashmir and Goa, to the senseless communal riots and the forcible eviction of half a million of its own Muslim citizens. India has written the crimson story of its aggressions in the blood of its innocent victims.

Earlier this year, the Indian Army violated the *status quo* in the Rann of Kutch. When Pakistan moved in to protect its territory, the Prime Minister of India threatened to retaliate at a time and place of his own choosing. He threatened to substantiate his warning by ordering a massive concentration of troops against the borders of Pakistan. Despite these serious provocations, Pakistan persisted, as in the past, in maintaining a balanced and constructive attitude which enabled us to reach an agreement for the settlement of the Rann-of-Kutch dispute.

For patience and persistence in a desire for friendship, Pakistan's record is unequalled. Throughout these 18 years, India has manifested positive hostility and an unmistakable deliberation in its actions which have been designed to cause the undoing of Pakistan. We have reasoned with India. We have appealed to the conscience of the world community and to the sense of justice and equity of all man-kind. We have pointed to the utter futility of this needless confrontation between neighbours. We have exercised every possible restraint on our people and followed a policy of moderation. The only thing that we have not done and will never do is to forsake our just cause and to sacrifice the five million Muslims of the State of Kashmir.

The territory of the State of Kashmir is in dispute and will remain in

dispute till the people have exercised their right to self-determination. It was the late Pandit Nehru himself who said:

> "India is a great country and Kashmir is in my heart. There is an enormous difference, not only geographically but in all kinds of factors there. Do you think you are dealing with a part of U.P. or Bihar or Gujrat?"

Who can then have doubt about the disputed status of this territory? It is certainly not Indian territory as already admitted by Pandit Nehru. No matter how many dubious means India adopts to try to make it appear as if Occupied Kashmir is a part of India, it will never become part of Indian territory.

Pakistan has never coveted one inch of Indian territory. In the State of Kashmir, it is the territory of Kashmiri people whose freedom we are pledged to secure, and not Indian territory, where our conflict lies.

It is not only the people of Pakistan who will not forsake the valiant fighters-for-freedom in Kashmir. Freedom-loving peoples throughout the world will support the heroic struggle which the people of Kashmir are now waging. The hundred million people of Pakistan have given a solemn pledge to the people of Kashmir. This pledge they will redeem.

Let India not be complacent in waging war in Kashmir. Let it not disregard the lessons of history. Let it not forget that if Pakistanis have hitherto shown the patience of Soloman they are also the descendants of the heroic soldiers of Islam, who never showed any hesitation in laying down their lives in defence of their honour and in the pursuit of justice.

If India wishes to prove that the sword is mightier than truth, let them but continue on their present path of adventure. A thousand years of history cannot go in vain, nor can the collective morality of this century be disregarded with impunity. In waging this war, India would be unleashing a tragedy of the greatest magnitude, a tragedy which would spell devastation.

This is the hour of reckoning. It is now that we are called upon to share our responsibilities and discharge our obligations to the people of Kashmir who are fighting fiercely to redeem themselves from Indian colonialism. We are confident that all friendly countries, in fact all those who stand for freedom and justice, will demonstrate their positive solidarity. This is an occasion which calls for a solidarity of the heart and mind, of values and beliefs. The whole concept of solidarity as a phenomenon in our international conduct demands that it must manifest itself in a concrete and tangible form on this present problem.

The heroic struggle of the people of Kashmir is a part of the glorious essay against colonial domination. Stage by stage, bit by bit, slavery and domination have been defeated. In its final phase in Kashmir the freedom

loving peoples of the world can put the last nail on the coffin of imperialism. This endeavour will not be for Pakistan nor will it be for the State of Kashmir. It will in fact represent the culmination of our contemporary struggle against tyranny and oppression, a struggle in which we must prove for all time that a just cause must triumph. It cannot and it shall not fail.

Printed at the Inter Services Press Ltd., Karachi J-228—June 1966—2,000.